

disposed of by the Government in any manner whatsoever; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5215. A bill to amend the Classification Act of March 4, 1923, as amended, to create a mechanical service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5216. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 5217. A bill granting travel pay and allowance for subsistence to certain soldiers of the Regular Army who served in the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 5218. A bill for the relief of Herman Paul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 5219. A bill to provide for the granting of rights-of-way for pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products and for telephone and/or telegraph lines through and across lands of the United States within the area of Indian Rock Dam and Reservoir, located in York County, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5220. A bill for the relief of R. W. Wood; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6022. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Joe Stuckey and 38 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6023. Also, petition of Anton Hoecker and 35 others protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6024. Also, petition of Leo H. Boehmer and 30 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6025. Also, petition of Martha Krueger and 58 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6026. Also, petition of Victor Becker and 73 other citizens protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 15, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., associate minister, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, how excellent is Thy name in all the earth. Thou hast set Thy glory above the heavens. We come to Thee. We find ourselves between an informing and warning past and an un-

certain but all-important future. We pray for all interests which enter into the making of a surer, stronger, safer world. We pray that our Government may be increasingly efficient and far reaching for good. May business, professional life, and industry ever be animated on behalf of human welfare. May our educational and religious agencies have unflinching success in advancing Thy plans for the whole wide world.

Be unto Thy servants of this and other departments of government wisdom for this day. May those who are kept by illness from places of duty have the blessings of the Great Physician. Bless their homes and families and the family life of all our people. Blot out our transgressions and create a new heart, we pray, in the whole earth. In the name of Him who gave His life for the establishment of righteousness and good will we make our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, August 18, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT BILL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Committee on Military Affairs, I think, will be able to report the surplus property disposal bill some time today. I therefore ask unanimous consent that authority be granted the committee to report the bill even though the Senate may not be in session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BENNETT CHAMP CLARK OF MISSOURI

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article on BENNETT CLARK, by Will P. Kennedy, published in yesterday's Washington Post.

Mr. President, as we all know, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has recently been defeated by a small majority for renomination, and I am sure every Member of the Senate who knows him greatly regrets that he will not serve longer with us. I think he has made one of the finest Senators that Missouri has ever had.

Mr. President, I do not know whether this is the proper time to say it, but I want to say a few words about BENNETT CLARK and his people. I have known BENNETT CLARK ever since he was a student in college. I knew him when he served as a Parliamentarian in the House of Representatives. I was a Member of the House at that time. His father, Champ Clark, was Speaker of the House about the time when I entered that body, and was Speaker when I left. He became my friend after I arrived and was always most friendly to me until the day of his death. Speaker Clark was one of the truly great men produced by this Republic. He was a great scholar, a

great thinker, a great doer, a great and eloquent talker, and a truly great statesman, with the biggest, kindest, most generous heart that any man ever had.

BENNETT CLARK has great ability, a fine brain, breeding, courtesy, genuineness, kindness, quickness of mind, simplicity of character, vigor of intellect, and is in every way a great and scholarly statesman. There is no better equipped Senator in this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

The defeat for renomination of Senator BENNETT CHAMP CLARK, of Missouri, removes temporarily from the Capitol political stage one of the great family names of American politics. Boy and man, BENNETT CLARK has been popular at the Capitol for more than 40 years. He graduated from Eastern High School in 1908, was Parliamentarian of the House from 1913 to 1917, when he attended the First Officers' Training Camp at Fort Myer; then was assistant chief of staff in the Eighty-eighth and Thirty-fifth Divisions, American Expeditionary Force and subsequently chairman of the Paris caucus of the 17 charter members who incorporated the American Legion. He was the youngest colonel in the American Army in France.

His father, former Speaker Champ Clark, whose real name was James Beauchamp Clark, first came into national politics in 1880, when he was a Presidential elector on the ticket of Hancock and English, when Garfield was elected. It is not generally known that Champ Clark was president of Marshall College, Huntington, W. Va., 1873 and 1874. He first came to Congress on March 4, 1893 (when his son BENNETT was 3 years old). Defeated in the Harding landslide of 1920, he died 2 days after his term was to end. He was Democratic leader in the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses and Speaker in the next two Congresses. His later years were embittered by the fact that he believed that the Presidential nomination had been stolen from him in the Baltimore convention of 1912, when he led on 29 ballots and had a clear majority on 8. What really broke his spirit, however, was the death of his grandson and namesake. In his reminiscences of a Quarter Century of American Politics, Champ Clark in a chapter on Heredity in Politics wrote: "There are many instances in our annals where the tendency toward political life and the ability to succeed therein have descended from father to son. In all fairness, it should be stated that in many cases the sons are of greater ability than their fathers." Champ Clark had gone to his reward 12 years before his son came to the Senate, February 3, 1933.

Speaker Champ Clark had two office boys who grew up together under his watchful eye and for whom he confidently predicted success in the public service. That estimation has been realized. He made each in turn his parliamentarian—first his son BENNETT, who later became United States Senator, and then CLARENCE CANNON, who later succeeded to his seat in the House and is now chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Senator CLARK, it will be remembered, led the fight in the 1936 Democratic National Convention for abolition of the party's two-thirds rule, which had blocked his father's nomination for President a quarter of a century previous.

The guiding hand of divine providence staged a scene in the Capitol a few years ago which must have pleased the soul of Champ Clark, looking down. One day Representative CANNON was called to the chair formerly occupied by Champ Clark by Speaker Bankhead to preside in the Committee of the

Whole House. And on the same day, at the same hour, Senator CLARK was called upon by Vice President Garner to preside in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 18th instant,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey) on August 19, 1944, signed the enrolled bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes," which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on August 19, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law Numbered 346, current session, entitled "Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944," in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 21, 1944, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE (H. DOC. NO. 671)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying recommendations, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 29, 1944, I had occasion to transmit to the Congress a declaration and two resolutions adopted by the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference, which was held in Philadelphia April 20-May 12, 1944. I then stated that upon receipt of the authentic text of the recommendations adopted by the conference I would transmit these to the Congress, as required by the constitution of the International Labor Organization. These texts having now been received, I transmit them herewith. The recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation (No. 67) concerning income security.

Recommendation (No. 68) concerning income security and medical care for persons discharged from the armed forces and assimilated services and from war employment.

Recommendation (No. 69) concerning medical care.

Recommendation (No. 70) concerning minimum standards of social policy in dependent Territories.

Recommendation (No. 71) concerning employment organization in the transition from war to peace.

Recommendation (No. 72) concerning the Employment Service.

Recommendation (No. 73) concerning the national planning of public works.

Employers and workers, as well as governments, were represented at the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference which adopted these recommendations by large majorities. As these recommendations were developed with a view to promoting the social security and economic advancement of the peoples of the world, our own included, I believe the Congress will find them valuable in its current consideration of problems of demobilization, reconversion of industry, employment, and social security.

At a later time I may have occasion to direct further attention to specific provisions of these recommendations and to suggest what action by the Congress on these recommendations may be advisable.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, August 22, 1944.

[Enclosure: Authentic copy of the recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-sixth session.]

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I request that the message from the President, with the accompanying papers, be printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT INTERNATIONAL PEACE ORGANIZATION—RESOLUTION OF INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Inter-American Bar Association at its third conference, held in the city of Mexico on August 7, 1944, a resolution concerning the establishment of a permanent international or-

ganization was adopted. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this association at its second conference held at Rio de Janeiro in August 1943 adopted resolution No. 4, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Inter-American Bar Association endorses as a primary peace objective the establishment and maintenance, at the earliest possible moment, of a universal international system, with judicial, legislative, and executive functions based on moral and juridical principles and on the internal experience of all nations and adapted to the requirements and limitations of international cooperation."

Now, therefore, consistent with and in further development of the principles and purposes so declared and supported in the foregoing resolution; be it

Resolved, That the Inter-American Bar Association, at its third conference held in the city of Mexico, D. C., on August 7, 1944, declares itself to favor the following principles and program in general terms, namely:

1. That a permanent international organization be established by the nations to maintain peace by the prevention and suppression of aggressive war.

2. That this permanent international organization should include a general assembly in which all of the nations shall be equally represented.

3. That the permanent international organization should include a permanent executive agency to administer the business of the organization between sessions of the assembly. The members of the executive agency shall be designated by the assembly.

4. That the general international organization include the existing Permanent Court of International Justice, with the necessary adaptation of its statute to the new organization, and the court should be empowered to create chambers, special or regional, as need arises, and

5. That the assembly have power to create from time to time such inferior courts as may be necessary.

FEDERAL AID FOR POST-WAR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION—REPORT OF POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported an original bill (S. 2105) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, and for other purposes, submitted a report (No. 1056) thereon, and the bill was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES REPORT ON GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 227)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment Senate

Resolution 318, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 318) submitted by Mr. BYRD on August 9, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 227, current session, an additional report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to Government corporations, be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY— REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2065) to establish a Surplus War Property Administration; to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property; and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1057) thereon.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BREWSTER (for Mr. BARKLEY), from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 2091. A bill for the relief of the Aetna Insurance Co.;

S. 2092. A bill for the relief of Ida Erickson;

S. 2093. A bill for the relief of Zella Rickard; and

S. 2094. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain military personnel for loss of personal property as a result of a fire which destroyed the laundry at Winter General Hospital, at Topeka, Kans., on March 31, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2095. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the United States Fish Hatchery property at Butte Falls, Oreg., to the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2096. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide a limitation on the time within which actions may be brought by carriers by motor vehicle for the recovery of their charges; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2097. A bill for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates; and

S. 2098. A bill for the relief of Lt. James H. Clark and Eleanor Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2099 (by request). A bill to place on the retired list certain former commissioned officers of the Army who served during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 2100. A bill to provide for the improvement and development of navigation, irri-

gation, and control of floods on the Missouri River and its tributaries, for the promotion of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of the Western Union Telegraph Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2102 (by request). A bill relating to transfer, inheritance and estate taxes on the transfer of certain properties of tribal and individual Osage Indians of Oklahoma; and

S. 2103 (by request). A bill to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma and conveyances in the State of Oklahoma where Indian lands of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians are involved; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

S. 2104. A bill to provide for increasing the loan rate in the case of loans upon cotton made by the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported original Senate bill 2105, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

AIR POLICY COMMISSION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, on August 18 the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] introduced Senate Joint Resolution 146 proposing the establishment of an air policy commission for the purpose of developing "sound national policies on the problem created by and associated with present and future developments in military and civil aviation."

The joint resolution was referred to the Military Affairs Committee. At the request of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who is unable to be present today, I am calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that in our view the reference to the Military Affairs Committee was inappropriate.

The Commerce Committee has had jurisdiction of civil aviation since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. The Commerce Committee has had a subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], devoted exclusively to the question of post-war air policy. It has been at work for at least a year. It has a complete record; it has heard all the witnesses in point; it has the obvious and logical jurisdiction over the entire subject matter, unless we propose to have chaos and confusion in respect to our dealings with this utterly serious and important subject.

I realize that military aviation has a place of great importance in the post-war situation but the subject of immediate and primary importance in respect to post-war aviation is the international situation and the domestic situation in civilian aviation. The best proof of this is the fact that the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Berle, has been to the British Isles and in conference with Lord Beaverbrook, speaking for the United Kingdom, in respect to post-war avia-

tion policies. The Clark committee to which I have referred has had long conferences with Assistant Secretary Berle. We who are related to the Commerce Committee and to the Clark subcommittee feel that it is a serious interruption of the work which has almost reached its conclusion to have the Murray joint resolution detoured to a committee which has never had any jurisdiction whatever over this phase of the matter.

I am therefore presenting my request not only in the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] but I am reenforced by the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who also is unable to be present today, and I am further reenforced by a telegram from the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] who has probably had more to do with aviation legislation than any other Member of the Senate and who asserts his belief that the joint resolution should go to the Commerce Committee rather than to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I wish to place myself in hearty accord with the statement made by the eminent Senator from Michigan. While I am a member of the Commerce Committee, and have been for a number of years, I am not a member of the subcommittee dealing with the subject matter of the joint resolution which was introduced by the senior Senator from Montana and referred to the Military Affairs Committee. I have, however, been in long distance communication with the very able chairman of the Commerce Committee, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who feels that, in view of the fact that the Commerce Committee has at all times had jurisdiction of the subject matter of this legislation and has been making an extensive study of it through the workings of the subcommittee, the joint resolution should be referred to the Commerce Committee and was improperly referred to the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. REYNOLDS] is not present; the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is not present; the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is not present. It therefore seems to me, as acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, that I should make a statement in regard to the request made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I am very glad to have him make his statement, but I want to preface what he is about to say as a matter of record by stating that I presented this entire matter by letter yesterday to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] so that he would be on

full notice as to what I was about to undertake.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I may say further that the committee understands that, because the clerk of the Commerce Committee came to the Military Committee and made this request on behalf of the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, I shall not resist in any way the request of the Senator from Michigan. I think, however, I should say, in behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and also in behalf of the committee—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will not in any way disagree with the statement—first, that the Senate ought to be given notice that the Senator from Montana is not here and that I am acting without consultation with him, although the Senator from Michigan has mentioned that he has consulted with the Senator from Montana; second, as the courtesy would be extended to the Foreign Relations Committee of consulting that committee if for example, the Commerce Committee wanted to report a measure affecting the international aviation situation, I think, as acting chairman of the Military Affairs Committee I should ask—and I am sure the Senator from Michigan will grant the request—that whenever any bill is reported the Committee on Military Affairs will have a chance to consider those parts of the bill which affect military aviation before they are reported to the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think that is a perfectly appropriate request and meets with my entire approval. On that basis, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Military Affairs Committee be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 146 and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, supplementing the statement of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the appropriate place a copy of the letter sent by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] chairman of the Commerce Committee, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Aeronautics, to the President regarding the current aviation situation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
August 19, 1944.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The profound significance of international air transport in the post-war world has led the Committee on Commerce of the Senate to appoint a subcommittee to consider appropriate changes in legislation dealing with this subject in order to assure the position of the United States in post-war air transport overseas.

The subcommittee has been holding extended hearings throughout the past year with thorough presentation of all points of view from Government officials and agencies concerned and also from various private interests involved.

We have been advised by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board that there are now pending before the Board approximately 500 applications for authority to operate domestic service within the territorial limits of the continental United States, as well as some 100 applications for authority to operate internationally or overseas between the United States and its territories; also, that the Board has denied the application for approval of the control of American Export Airlines, Inc., by American Export Lines, Inc., a surface carrier. This decision seems sound and in line with the long-established policy of Congress, that one form of transport shall not control a competitive form of transport.

The committee is deeply impressed with the importance of the decisions which must now be reached: Whether there should be any change in United States policy in the matter of regulating international air transport with foreign countries and whether the United States should have a number of American flag air lines operating abroad or concentrate American operations under a single system in which all transportation interests able to contribute would be permitted to participate. In these decisions the advantage of any one air line or group of air lines must be subordinated to the paramount national interest. Policies which will best assure the United States retaining the position of leadership in international air transport, to which its resources and geographical situation entitle it, should be adopted.

The question of whether or not the United States should now modify its historic position as to sovereignty of the air above its borders and to what extent the United States may wisely go in subscribing to the various doctrines being proposed that contemplate general agreements with another nation or group of nations concerning freedom of the air or freedom of innocent transit seems to the committee to invite the most careful consideration by both the executive and legislative branches of the Government and particularly of those concerned with the determination of policy.

Whether or not operating franchises in foreign countries should in general continue to be secured by direct application of the American flag air line concerned or through governmental negotiations is also pressing for a decision. Prior to the war operating franchises in approximately 50 foreign countries and colonies had been granted to the American flag air line system by the foreign governments concerned. The advantages or disadvantages of any change in this previously prevailing practice may well be weighed carefully.

All the evidence before the committee has indicated that approximately 75 percent of international air travel may be expected to be of United States origin. Under these circumstances the United States would seem to be entitled to expect a position of pre-eminence in international air operation.

In the special report of the Civil Aeronautics Board on international air transport policy under date of April 12, 1944, it is recommended that the governmental agreements suggested "should place no limitation on the total volume of operation on particular routes agreed upon." The consequences of such a policy, if adopted, seem to the committee to offer great dangers to the development of United States international air transport. Under such a policy under the lower operating costs of foreign carriers with lower wage levels traffic of United States origin might well come to be monopolized by foreign flag lines to the very great preju-

dice of the national interests of the United States.

International air transport commenced at the conclusion of the last war in 1919. For the first few years competition abroad existed between air lines of the same nationality. This competition between international air lines of the same nationality soon gave way in most countries to a system of zone monopolies whereby competition was restricted to foreign-flag services. Prior to the Second World War, however, all the principal foreign trading nations had entirely abandoned competition abroad between their own air lines and had also given up even their zone monopolies. Without exception, they had merged their international air transport operations into single national air-line systems or chosen instruments to strengthen their competitive position in the field of international air transport. In the United States a similar development had occurred, although without formal legislative declaration but as a result of administrative action under existing law. As a result in the last decade the United States system came to lead the world in route mileage and in commercial service.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has indicated certain routes that it considers to be in the national interest and consideration of operations on these routes is now being urged.

Whether or not American international air transport should follow the pattern that has been adopted by all principal foreign trading nations, or should develop several independent systems, each to serve a separate trade area abroad, presents a question of policy for legislative as well as executive consideration.

A number of important American companies concerned with air as well as surface transportation have presented the advantages of creating a community company to represent the United States effort abroad in which all transportation interests able to contribute by air, sea, and land may pool their resources and facilities to present a united and coordinated air transport system to meet the undoubted severe competition of other nations that the United States must face in the post-war period and American labor organizations have shown great interest in the advantages of such a plan.

The alternative proposal is for what would approximate regional monopolies serving the principal world areas originating air traffic, with competition supplied by foreign air lines.

The Commerce Committee concerned with this situation are very appreciative of the cooperation of the various Government agencies and the advice which have been received regarding the pending situation and prospective developments.

The committee will appreciate continuing to be kept advised, and meanwhile would request that no action be taken regarding international air transport applications for new routes or acquisition of existing service outside the continental United States and Canada until full consideration of Government policy can be had by Congress.

The Civil Aeronautics Board advises the committee "that if an important international proceeding should be concluded within 8 months from the time it started, we would feel that a very satisfactory time schedule had been maintained."

In view of this time lag, the committee feels no prejudice to the national interest would be involved in deferring definitive decision on international applications until the Congress shall have had opportunity for considering all phases of the situation and for taking such legislative action as might then seem wise.

The committee further feels that any hearings at this time on applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity for overseas or foreign service should be with the

full understanding by all concerned that certain changes in policy may occur and that no action should be taken which would complicate the situation or prejudice the ultimate decision by the legislative authorities concerned with policy. The committee is in full accord with the Civil Aeronautics Board and the other executive agencies concerned in recognizing the advisability of "active consideration of the question of the over-all policy relating to our very important international air transportation services."

This letter is being forwarded to you as the final authority under existing law on the issuance of certificates for the operation of United States air lines in overseas and international transportation. A copy is being forwarded to the Civil Aeronautics Board, who must approve applications for acquisition or mergers of American-flag carriers in the international field.

Cordially yours,

JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
KENNETT CHAMP CLARK,
Chairman, Subcommittee on
Civil Aeronautics.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR PROPERTY— AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2065) to establish a Surplus War Property Administration, to provide for the proper disposal of surplus war property, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 322), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the special committee authorized by Senate Resolution 263, Seventy-eighth Congress, to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various Presidential candidates, Vice Presidential candidates, and candidates for the United States Senate, and facts relating thereto, is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate \$40,000 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purpose.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AFFECTING THE HOG, CATTLE, POULTRY, AND DAIRY INDUSTRIES SITUATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with further reference to Senate Resolution 309, submitted by me for myself and a number of other Senators on June 15 last, which asks for an investigation into the livestock and feeding and distribution operations, I present a letter written by Mr. Louis Kavan, of Omaha, Nebr., general secretary of the Federation of Nebraska Retailers, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, together with a copy of the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, Senate Resolution 309, as reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 309

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to

make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining—

(1) the conditions prevailing in the production, processing, distribution, and marketing of livestock, livestock feed, poultry, eggs, milk, and the products thereof;

(2) the effect of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) any practices wherein processors and distributors of such commodities are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(4) reasons for the failures to support prices to producers as required by existing law;

(5) alleged adverse effects of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly the extent to which livestock feeders have been penalized because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock;

(6) alleged adverse effects upon the livestock, poultry, and dairy industries of the price and other policies relative to corn and other feed grains and the maladjustments resulting therefrom.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

FEDERATION OF NEBRASKA RETAILERS,

Omaha, Nebr., August 5, 1944.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is a known fact that for the past several months large chain-food corporations have been taking over a number of slaughtering plants in various sections of the United States. While quota restrictions were in force, these chain-owned slaughtering plants were forced to comply with certain regulations as to distributing meat within the territories formerly supplied by the slaughtering plant when individually owned. Since quota restrictions have been taken off, these chain slaughtering plants have increased considerably the number of animals slaughtered, and in all probability are diverting most of the finished product to their own retail outlets. This in itself can create very serious conditions for the civilians living in the territories formerly supplied by privately owned slaughtering plants, and it can aid materially into the broadening of black markets.

The chains are placed into an advantageous position by owning their own slaughtering plants, as irrespective of the amount of losses, they at least will have a supply of meat for their retail stores. The greatest injustice, however, both to the livestock raiser and to

the civilian is that these chain-owned and operated slaughtering plants are only interested in the better grade of animal. They will seek to purchase only animals that will grade good or choice. They are not interested in canners and cutters, cows, and lower grades, therefore they place an added burden upon the large packers who, if they are to buy better grades of beef, are forced to bid a higher price in competition with the chain slaughterer. Livestock producers of this country are no doubt being penalized since the inception of chain slaughtering plants. On the other hand, if the large packers are forbidden, under the packers' consent decree, to own and operate retail outlets, then the same legal provision should be made to apply in the case of chain stores.

An immediate investigation should be made and measures taken to correct this unfair condition before the American farmer and civilians are forced to suffer unnecessarily.

Yours for victory,

LOUIS KAVAN, Secretary.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 94, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 55,000 additional copies of Public Law No. 346, current session, entitled "Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944," of which 45,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room and 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

APPRAISEMENT OF THE CHICAGO DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Appraisal of the Chicago Convention," delivered by the Honorable Josephus Daniels to the Kiwanis Club at Raleigh, N. C., on August 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA ON MAJOR BILLS AND OTHER MEASURES RELATING TO AGRICULTURE, LABOR, AND NATIONAL DEFENSE, AND ON VETOED BILLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the votes cast by him on major bills, resolutions, and amendments with respect to agriculture, labor, and national defense, and on vetoed bills, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE—ARTICLE BY JUSTICE HOMER HOCH

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Electing a President of the United States," by Justice Homer Hoch, of the Supreme Court of the State of Kansas, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "M. V. A. Goes to the Senate," dealing with the proposed Missouri Valley authority, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of August 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 1944 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM BY JOHN B. ELLIOTT

[Mr. DOWNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "War Calls for Candor—Republican Platform Fails," by John B. Elliott, being an analysis of the 1944 Republican platform, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE AND THE MOVING PICTURE "WOODROW WILSON"

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, when the George reconversion bill recently was passed by the Senate, I stated my opinion that it would prove woefully defective in meeting the impact of post-war readjustment. I am still of that opinion and I hope that before our economy has imposed upon it the stress and strain that must come from cessation of war production we will more wisely prepare for the dynamic age into which soon we will be engulfed.

But I think that one may turn from our present failure in the domestic field to the international arena with a feeling of high optimism and courage. Great events are in the making at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and a world that is sick of war and anarchy should find inspiring hope as the mighty dream of Woodrow Wilson for world security, peace, and justice is being forged into implemented reality. The Dumbarton Conference was called by the United States Government under the leadership and direction of Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull; it fulfills the prophetic vision of Woodrow Wilson; it is the first formal move to carry out the Moscow Declaration which obligated the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and China to create "a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

The Senate of the United States by an almost unanimous vote has already endorsed the findings of the Moscow Conference, and I think we may safely assume will likewise approve the treaty that will develop out of it and through the present and succeeding conferences of the great and small nations.

It is difficult to think of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference—which today is earnestly seeking for the best kind of a league of nations—without thinking also of Woodrow Wilson, whose prophetic vision after the last war saw the vital need of one, and whose courageous heart and body were broken in his struggle to attain it.

I take some pride because one of the movie companies of my State—the Twentieth Century-Fox—has recently completed and released a mighty, historical film portraying the life of Woodrow Wilson. Some Army officials, seeing this production, were immediately convinced that it was propaganda of a political nature and hastily announced a ban against its showing at our military camps. That ban, improperly and irregularly announced, was almost at once withdrawn, as there never was any justification for it.

So far as I have read what they have had to say, critics proclaim the picture Wilson not only great art and entertainment, but likewise historically true to an amazing degree. But it may well be that historical fact, sincerely and dramatically portrayed, may be the most persuasive of arguments moving us to energetic and determined action. Indeed, I think that is true of this epic film Wilson, and that almost everyone who sees it will leave the theater with a greater understanding of the profound vision of this great American President, and a stronger determination that the noble ideals and ideas for which he died shall now prevail.

I believe that when the victorious soldiers and sailors of the Allies again return from distant seas and foreign battlefields they will find a world in which orderly rule is firmly entrenched to maintain peace and honor among all nations everywhere.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS AND FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, there are pending on the calendar two bills, House bill 3961 and Louse bill 4485, the first relating to river and harbor improvement legislation and the other to flood control. It was my privilege and honor to report both bills to the Senate from the Committee on Commerce. It has been my desire and it is still my desire to have both bills taken up as promptly as possible under all circumstances. Both bills have been acted upon by the House. Extensive hearings were held with respect to the river and harbor bill and also with respect to the flood-control bill in committee in the House, and the House passed both bills and sent them to the Senate.

When the bills came to the Senate they were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and were sent to a subcommittee of that committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and quite prolonged hearings were held with respect to both measures. The river and harbor bill was reported to the Senate on May 25, and the flood-control bill was reported to the Senate on June 22 of this year.

Mr. President, a number of Senators have from time to time asked me when the two bills were coming up for consideration. I am receiving numerous communications from individuals throughout the United States who are interested in both measures and who want to know when they are going to be disposed of. Representatives of the press call on me daily to ascertain at what time the bills will come before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. President, I realize that we shall shortly have before us important post-war legislation which we must dispose of. I refer to the bill dealing with the disposal of surplus property, which will be reported today, and I presume will come up for consideration tomorrow. I know that that bill necessarily will have precedence over the proposed river and harbor and flood-control legislation. But the people generally throughout the United States are very much interested in the bills dealing with river and harbor

improvements and flood control, and I desire, Mr. President, to ascertain from the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is representing the majority leader, and who, I presume, has consulted with the majority leader with reference to both bills, and from the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, their views concerning when the bills can be taken up and considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Louisiana has well said, of course, the important bills which deal with making plans and preparations for the post-war period must be considered and disposed of first. As the Senator from Louisiana has intimated the Senate will very likely tomorrow take up the bill dealing with the disposition of surplus property. How long it will take the Senate to consider and finally act on that bill, of course, no one can prophesy. As we know, the House has taken an unusual length of time to consider the proposed legislation. Many amendments have been offered to the bill now pending in the House. So, as I have said, no one can tell how long it will take the Senate to act on the proposed legislation.

Then, of course, after the bill shall have been passed by the two Houses it will have to go to conference, and a conference report will have to be acted upon.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, the George bill is now pending in the Ways and Means Committee of the other House. Of course, that bill will have to be finally disposed of.

I may say that I talked with the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a day or two before he was compelled to leave the city. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, there is no better friend of river and harbor improvements or flood-control development than the Senator from Kentucky. His whole record is one of consistent and enthusiastic support of such developments. But it was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky, when I last talked with him, that in view of the urgency of the post-war legislation and in view of the fact that there was at least one highly controversial matter involved in the river and harbor bill, a matter which might provoke long and protracted debate, he hardly thought it would be possible to take up that bill at the present time. It was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky that very likely both bills would have to go over until after November 7. Of course, the Senator from Louisiana is far more familiar than I am with the fact that there is a highly controversial issue involved in those bills, an issue which would be hard fought, long fought, and would cause protracted debate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Alabama if it is contemplated that during the 2½ months which will elapse between now and November 7 the Senate will remain

in session, or whether a long recess is anticipated. If we are to remain in session, I can see no justification for the postponement of these bills until after election. The proposed legislation is important. Last Friday, in discussing the proceedings of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I expressed my interest on the floor of the Senate. I am most anxious that this legislation be given consideration as soon as that having precedence over it by reason of its importance is out of the way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Arkansas that I share his desire for prompt action on those bills. I have a very deep interest in their passage.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the Senator has.

Mr. HILL. However, I believe it was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky that after disposing of the bills dealing with post-war matters, namely, the George bill and the surplus-property disposition bill, which the Senate will take up for consideration tomorrow, the Senate would perhaps then be in recess, unless something unforeseen should occur, or unless something urgent should be presented to the Senate for action. After disposing of the bills to which I have referred, I believe it was the thought of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate would be in recess until after November 7.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the program, and if that plan is to be followed, I, for one, would like to see those measures made a special order of business immediately following the reconvening of the Senate after November 7. River and harbor and flood-control legislation is imperative. The bills must not be permitted to die on the calendar. We are undertaking to enact bills providing huge funds for unemployment compensation. Our first duty is to provide employment; and if we fail in our duty to enact constructive measures which would be beneficial to the Nation, and which would develop our resources, then we must take the responsibility for having to provide what I should regard in many cases as unnecessary unemployment compensation—unnecessary because of our failure to meet our obligations to provide for public-works projects which would enhance the wealth of the Nation.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I find myself very much in accord with what the Senator from Arkansas has said. The point which he makes is very well taken. We are undertaking to provide employment in the post-war period. Both the measures to which I refer provide for employment in connection with river and harbor and flood-control projects, even before the cessation of hostilities, under certain circumstances with which Senators who have read the bills are familiar. It is not necessary for me to go into them.

It has been said that there is one controversial item in the bills. There are two or three controversial items. In view of that fact, I think it is very important

that a day certain be set, if possible, for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bills.

I realize the situation in which the able Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the majority leader, find themselves. Realizing what the situation is, I do not feel that I could successfully oppose the suggestion to take up both bills after November 7; but if possible I should like to have a day fixed for their consideration.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I find myself very much in accord with the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Louisiana, namely, that these bills must not be permitted to die on the calendar. They must be acted upon by the Senate, with final action by the Congress during the present session of Congress.

The Senator from Kentucky will undoubtedly return to the city shortly. The Senate will be in session, considering the war property disposal bill and the George bill, for some days to come. I think it is very probable that the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Arkansas can reach some understanding with the Senator from Kentucky to fix a day certain for the consideration of those bills.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Louisiana was good enough to express an interest in my view about the situation, and I am very glad to state my present view.

I believe that for the immediate present the situation is substantially as the Senator from Alabama has stated. We have pending two measures of great importance having to do with reconversion and post-war problems. One is pending before a Senate committee and will soon be reported to the Senate. The other is pending in a committee of the House and I am advised that it will be reported to the House in a very short time, perhaps within 2 or 3 days. If my judgment about the situation is good, I think it will be at least 2 weeks before the two measures to which I have referred, which have to do with the post-war period, are ultimately disposed of. In my view it would be quite impossible to deal with the river and harbor bill, the flood control bill, or the highway bill within that time. I believe that we should wait until the pending legislation is out of the way before we undertake to come to any conclusions about new legislation.

There is some question as to whether these subject matters ought to be dealt with separately, or whether, instead, there should be an over-all public-works program which would embody the various proposals for flood control, highways, and river and harbor improvements, and possibly other opportunities to provide work to those who may need work in the post-war days. Some Senators have that view about the matter. I am not sure that they are not correct. But certainly the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill have in them

much of a controversial nature. We cannot take up those measures immediately. When the immediate pressure is released, and when we shall have disposed of the pending post-war problems so far as legislation can dispose of them, I expect that we shall have a very meager attendance in this body, and perhaps no attendance at all in the other body until the election is out of the way.

So if I may presume to offer advice, it is that the matter be allowed to remain as it now is until we shall have reconvened after the election. We can then determine, in the light of the circumstances at that time, what ought to be done about those measures.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I feel some concern over the statement made by the Senator from Maine. He indicates that probably we ought to allow the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, which have been on the calendar for some time, to go over until legislation can be prepared in reference to other public works and improvements, so that the various subjects may be taken up either in one grand and glorious bill, or considered one after the other. Both these bills are ready for action.

Mr. WHITE. I stated I believed there was a substantial view of that sort in this body.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not wish for a moment to appear to lend any countenance to that view, because I think it is wholly fallacious.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. VANDENBERG addressed the chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Louisiana on his anxiety and his efforts to obtain consideration for these bills. I realize the difficulties suggested by the Senator from Alabama; but it seems to me that these bills ought not to be deferred or sidetracked until some more comprehensive public-works bill, as suggested by the Senator from Maine, may be brought forth. There is an element of public employment involved in both measures. The bills have been well considered. My State is deeply interested in both of them. I hope the Senator from Louisiana may be successful in obtaining as early consideration as possible under the circumstances. I merely wish to reinforce what he has said.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that in discussing this question we confront a condition, and not a theory. One of the controversies involved in the river and harbor bill, the Missouri Valley controversy, monopolized the attention of his own committee for 2 or 3 weeks, almost day and night. I anticipate that it will be equally monopolizing when it reaches the attention of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. I hope not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In addition, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] has given notice that he intends to attach the St. Lawrence seaway project to the river and harbor bill. I do not need to remind Senators that that would require at least a day or two of discussion.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the Senator must find 5 or 6 clear weeks before he can hope to have his river and harbor bill reach a conclusion, unless the Missouri River problem and the Central Valley problem in California can be compromised on some amicable basis before we begin.

There are many things in the river and harbor bill which I cordially agree ought to be acted upon. There are other things in the river and harbor bill which, in my opinion, ought to be thrown out the window. But in striving to anticipate a program, I respectfully suggest to the Senator that as things now stand, it will be exceedingly difficult to reach a conclusion in respect to the river and harbor bill unless there is a very substantial amount of time available for discussion.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for reinforcing my argument. The sooner we get to both bills, the better it will be, for the reasons he stated.

I promised to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Burton]. I am very glad to yield to him. He has been a very helpful and industrious member of the subcommittee which attended the hearings, and was in daily attendance and gave very careful thought to every project in the bill. I now yield to him.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it is as a member of the subcommittee that I wish to say just a word, because it seems to me that here we have two well-thought-out programs for post-war work. There is no question that in both bills there is a great volume of instances with respect to which the engineers have approved and worked out programs which will be of constructive value to the Nation. Under those circumstances it would be tragic if there were delay in approving this valuable program, and if we were to go ahead with something less valuable. It would be even more tragic if we failed entirely to adopt any program of river and harbor improvement and flood control. Therefore, I am in entire agreement with the Senator from Louisiana in urging the earliest possible consideration of both these bills, and as separate bills.

It seems to me that while there are controversies as to the rivers and harbors bill, they relate only to particular projects in it. It will not take long to dispose of that particular bill.

As to the flood-control bill, I believe it will take considerable time to dispose of it unless some compromise can be reached on the Missouri River project. But I believe the intervening time can well be spent in attempting to reach agreement on that.

Therefore, I hope it will be possible to work out an agreement as to the time when these two important bills can be considered and acted upon. I agree that a definite date should be set down for bringing up the river and harbor bill

first, if possible, because I believe these national projects should be approved, and that the projects should be ready to be put into operation at the earliest possible date when they shall be needed. There are so many projects which are not worth spending money on that it seems to me these projects, which have the benefit of approval by the Army engineers and which have been favorably acted upon by the House and are ready for action by the Senate, should be promptly acted on by the Senate. The Senate should not be the body which fails to provide for valuable and desirable post-war projects of that kind.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator from Louisiana has correctly stated my view. Coming from the Missouri River region, as I do, I know that the people there are interested in both the river and harbor bill and the flood-control bill, as is evidenced by a resolution adopted by the Governors of nine States, in meeting at Omaha, Nebr., on August 5 and 6. With the Senator's permission, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the resolution adopted by the Governors of the Missouri River States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE TO SECURE A BASIN-WIDE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

We, the Governors of the States in the Missouri River Basin, namely: Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri, and the members of the Missouri River States Committee, meeting at Omaha, Nebr., on August 5 and 6, 1944, after hearing and conferring with representatives of various Federal agencies, including the United States Army Engineer Corps and the United States Bureau of Reclamation, do now firmly and earnestly petition the President and Congress of the United States to give force and effect to the following conclusions:

1. That in dealing with matters relating to the waters of the Missouri River Basin it be recognized that we are dealing with one river and one problem.
2. That in approaching that problem and in order to serve all the people of the basin to the maximum possible degree and to safeguard their present established rights and their future development and prosperity, there can be no piecemeal legislative program.
3. That there must be an over-all comprehensive plan and suitable legislation adopted by the Congress of the United States which will accomplish that purpose.
4. That the omnibus flood-control bill, insofar as it deals with the Missouri River, furnishes the framework for flood control and related purposes.
5. That authorization of the Bureau of Reclamation plan now before Congress and embodied in the Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, is necessary to a comprehensive development of the Missouri River Basin.
6. That those provisions of the Rivers and Harbors omnibus bill which relate to navigation on the Missouri River below Sioux City, Iowa, vitally affect the economic life and

plans for future development of the entire Missouri River Basin.

7. That to develop the basin fully and for the greatest benefit of its citizens, both present and future, and for the greatest benefit to the United States of America, the Congress of the United States should recognize now the problem in its entirety as it affects the people of the Missouri Basin and their economic destiny and that of the United States of America.

8. That in order to accomplish this unity of purpose and action we ask the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the United States Army engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation to bring before the Congress a coordinated plan, based on the proposed legislation and official documents heretofore mentioned which will make possible the authorization by the Congress, now, of the Missouri River basin development program in its entirety by such amendments to legislation now pending as are feasible from the standpoint of legislative procedures.

The foregoing was unanimously adopted by the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. The representatives of the State of Iowa being absent at the time, the vote of that State was not recorded.

Thereupon the meeting considered the following statement:

Nothing done in the interests of flood control or navigation shall adversely affect the use of water for irrigation west of the ninety-seventh meridian.

This statement was agreed to by the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. The representatives of the State of Iowa being absent, the vote of that State was not recorded. The State of Missouri being present and represented did not choose to join in the last-mentioned statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should also like to commend the Senator from Louisiana for his interest in the matter of having both these bills taken up for early consideration. I endorse what he said; and because I come from a section of the country which is vitally interested in both bills, I, too, should like to have a definite date set, if possible, for their consideration.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], that we might tentatively agree on some date in November. I assure him that if on account of much more pressing legislation those bills could not be taken up then, I should be very glad indeed to cooperate, as I have always endeavored to do. But the people of my State and a number of Senators—in fact, practically all of them—are very anxious to know definitely, if they can, when this proposed legislation will be considered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that if he will be patient for a day or two, I am quite certain the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, will be back, and at that time I will be glad to join with him in an effort to make certain that these bills are passed during this session of Congress, and that final congressional action is taken on them, so that they may become law during the present

session. I shall be glad to join with the Senator in that effort.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.
INTERNATIONAL PEACE MACHINERY—
THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on yesterday there convened at Washington, at Dumbarton Oaks, a notable international conference. Representatives of the United States, Russia, and Great Britain have met in what may be called exploratory conversations respecting the structure of international peace machinery to effect what we hope will affect all the nations of the earth, the great nations as well as the small ones.

Mr. President, it is somewhat difficult to realize the tremendous significance of such a meeting. Personally, I think we stand at the crossroads. I think the outcome of this conference will mean either that we shall go forward in the establishment of peace machinery or that we shall miserably fail in one of the greatest undertakings with which the Nation has ever been confronted.

The story of the efforts of the United States toward world peace afford an interesting background of what is now presented. Recently I have been reading about the establishment of what was known as the League to Enforce Peace, which antedated the World War. Some of the most notable men in the United States took part in the establishment of that organization. It did a great deal toward crystallizing public sentiment and stimulating thought along the lines of what was called an enforced peace.

I shall not dwell upon the transactions of 1919 and 1920. I believe that all the world has now come to the conclusion that unless we are to look forward in the next generation to another world war, brought on by ambition, resentment, anger, and hatred, perhaps on the part of those who may be conquered in the pending war—unless we wish to look forward to that kind of eventuality it behooves the people of the United States and of all the world, for that matter, wholeheartedly to join in the effort to create, establish, and maintain international peace machinery.

Mr. President, we cannot, of course, hope to create an agency which will be pleasing to everyone in all its details. Some will take exception to this, that, or the other. That would not be unnatural. When the Constitution of the United States was established there was disagreement over some of its provisions. There were notable contests in the conventions of several States over the ratification or nonratification of the product of the Convention of 1787. I recall that in the Virginia convention great figures like Patrick Henry, George Mason, and others resisted ratification, and it was finally achieved by a margin of only 10 votes. The same situation prevailed in the conventions of some of the other States.

So, Mr. President, as we approach the work of the present conference which, in the course of due time, will be followed by another conference on a higher level, I hope the people of the United States, and particularly Members of the Senate

and of the House of Representatives, will work together in peace and in unity, looking forward to the larger concept of the organization.

As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I wish to pay my sincere tribute to the Republican members of the committee for their approach to the present problem. There was no evidence of partisanship in the work which they have done. There was no evidence of pettifoggery. There was no disposition to inject matters of factional or partisan consideration.

The subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations was composed of the chairman, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. I am deeply grateful to each member for their patriotic and arduous labors in conference with the Secretary of State and in committee. I particularly wish to express my sense of gratitude to the Senators who represented the minority on the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. For approximately 6 months they labored in framing and presenting to the Senate the resolution which was adopted by the Senate on November 5, 1943. Irrespective of party affiliations, that resolution has met with widespread approval throughout the United States. It does not, of course, undertake to go into all the details, activities, and aspects of the proposed organization, but in a large way it lays before the people of the United States and of the world the basic structure and considerations which such an organization should embrace.

I wish also to pay my respects to those Republicans who in the Mackinac resolution at an early date labored well and handsomely toward creating what, according to their minds, was a workable and satisfactory structure of a peace organization.

Mr. President, I wish also to express my deep sense of gratitude to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE.] They were members of the subcommittee to which I have made reference, and they labored long and arduously. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] also participated in conferences with the Secretary of State. He is now a useful member of the committee.

In addition to the work which was performed in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, almost weekly during a period of nearly a year we consulted with the Secretary of State in regard to the approaching difficulties which were to be presented. In all those conferences there was no partisanship; there was no effort to obtain a partisan advantage; and there was no effort to waylay and attack from the flank anything which we were undertaking to do.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the spirit which I have attempted to describe may continue. I am sure that it will continue.

I wish to express my sense of appreciation to the authors of the original so-called B.H. resolution, Senate Resolution 114. I wish particularly to pay my sincere appreciation to those Senators because I realize their sincerity and their earnestness. While the subcommittee did not wholly agree with the resolution in its essential details, it did agree with the great objective which the sponsors of the resolution had in mind. There was no difference in the ambition of any of us to bring about one great concrete result, namely, the creation of an instrumentality by which questions could be tested not by swords and cannon, but by logic and reason. In the event a decision were to be made that there must be no aggression by those who would seek by force of arms and might to overrun their peaceful neighbors, it was intended that an organization should be created which would have sufficient power and force to prevent the conditions against which we were inveighing.

I believe that by now practically all elements of our people have arrived at the opinion that an international organization must be endowed with a sufficient armed force—naval and military—to prevent the occurrences which have resulted in this terrible and tragic war.

Mr. President, the three great countries which, through their representatives, are now holding conferences have, of course, been in conference over a considerable period of time by personal contact as well as by correspondence. It is very gratifying to witness the fine spirit which seems to actuate them at the present moment. A little later representatives of China will be called into conference. After the preliminary conversations shall have come to an end a conference on a higher level will be convened, and in due time representatives of all the people of the nations of the world, however small their territories may be, will be called into conference in order that the small nations shall have a voice and a representation in the peace machinery. After all, Mr. President, the small and weak nations are the ones which will receive the greatest benefits from such an organization as the one being proposed. As a rule they are more often attacked by the more powerful, the more aggressive, and those who are ambitious to achieve military mastery, than are the great and strong powers.

Mr. President, in the liquidation of this war after it shall have come to an end it will not be practicable immediately to conclude a treaty of peace. Pending a definite treaty of peace it may be necessary for the four great powers participating on the Allied side to maintain contact and concert of action in bringing about control and supervision in enemy countries. We cannot permit chaos and anarchy to break out in any of the countries which have been overrun and occupied. We cannot permit those conditions to obtain even in the enemy countries. So far as the war itself is concerned the great powers must continue

to act in harmony. It does not follow, however, as a result that the permanent peace structure which we hope to set up will in any way be modified.

Mr. President, I am sure that Secretary Hull and those associated with him in this enterprise welcome conferences with any one who has a thought to suggest and who will come to them in a spirit of helpfulness and cooperation. I am sure that that is their attitude. It is the attitude of our Committee on Foreign Relations and its subcommittee. We want suggestions from any source, provided they come in a spirit of helpfulness and not in one of enmity and a determination to obstruct the processes of the conference.

So the prospects of the conference's successful outcome are very propitious, indeed. There seems to prevail a spirit of cooperation, of good will, and a desire to unite in the creation of the peace structure.

Mr. President, I do not think, however, that our people should be led to the conclusion that this war is already over, because it is not. While reports from the battlefields of Europe have been very impressive and inspiring, while they have offered much hope of an early termination of the war, we cannot afford to relax one inch; we cannot let anything cause us to recede from the aggressive militant spirit that will be required to win this war. We hope in due course, however, to establish an agency which will offer hope to the peoples of the earth, which will offer hope to the small and the weak nations, which will offer hope to the nations who entertain peaceful ambitions, and will offer condemnation to nations that entertain visions of conquest of their neighbors or the overrunning of the world and the establishment of military monarchies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is chairman of a committee of the House and Senate, I think, which has been conferring with Secretary Hull regarding the general character of the post-war peace organization?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that I am not chairman of the joint committee. I am chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, but groups from both House and the Senate for over a considerable period have conferred with Secretary Hull.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested to know whether that committee is sitting in on the Dumbarton Oaks Conference or whether they are keeping in touch with it or keeping advised of it, or what the status is. What is the relation of the committee created by Congress with the present Dumbarton Oaks Conference?

Mr. CONNALLY. The present conference does not include members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. The present group is more of a meeting of technicians concerned with the physical integration of what the larger policy that is indicated to them might be. However, I shall say to the

Senator from Ohio that I have had up with the Secretary of State the matter of our being kept informed, and I have assurances that daily, if necessary, and from time to time the Committee on Foreign Relations will be kept advised of the progress of these negotiations and of any matter of sufficient importance to attract the attention of the committee. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. In a way, then, the committee is on a higher level than those who are conferring; and when the conference reaches a higher level, then the committee of the Senate will participate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that that is true. The Senator is aware of the fact, of course, that in the United States the custom has always been for the Executive to handle the negotiations and that the matters were simply submitted to the Senate at a later time. I wish to say to the Senator that Mr. Hull and his associates have not taken that position. They have evidenced a desire to have the cooperation of and to cooperate with the Senate, and while we perhaps may not be members even of the higher level, it might overbalance the representation from other countries if that happened—we will be kept advised; we will have access to the Secretary of State, and, if necessary, to other functionaries connected with the matter. I have no fear that there will be any sort of ignoring of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I say a word at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think I owe it to the Secretary of State to add at this point that he personally communicated with me, representing the minority group of the special committee, and personally placed at my disposal any information I may seek at any time regarding any phase of the Dumbarton Oaks conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator from Ohio supplementing what the Senator from Michigan has said, that he called the subcommittee into conference and handed each one of its members a complete draft of what was in his mind as to the general structure of the peace organization. It was confidential; it was not given to the public; but I simply cite that fact to show the evidence of entire willingness to keep the Senate advised and to take us into confidence.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested in determining what the exact status was.

While I am on my feet, however, I should like to ask the Senator one other question. I was somewhat alarmed to read in the New York Times of Friday, August 18, what purports to be an interview with our Ambassador, Mr. W. Averell Harriman. There he is cited by a Polish newspaper in regard to a conference held with the Polish committee which was set up under the auspices of the Russian Government. I quote from the article:

It cites Mr. Harriman's declaration to the Polish National Council's representatives that

the "alliance between the United States of America and the United Soviet Socialist Republics is firm and is expected to endure for decades."

I wonder if the Senator could tell me whether there is any such alliance or whether that is a misquotation of the Ambassador's statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think that is a rhetorical flourish on the part of the Ambassador.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator thinks there is no alliance?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no alliance in the sense of any treaty or any binding commitment. I think what he means there is that as a result of this war our relations have been drawn much more closely together and that the unity and harmony to wind up the war and to liquidate it will probably be extended to the future.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator feels confident that there is no alliance of any kind, secret or otherwise?

Mr. CONNALLY. We have the assurance from the highest possible sources that there were no commitments whatever made at Moscow, Teheran, Cairo, or Casablanca that will be binding on this Government.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been very much interested in what the Senator has had to say with regard to the relations of the Secretary of State with the committees of Congress on this all-important and vital subject because I think that relationship itself may well spell the success or failure of any plan; and, from what I have heard said here, I take it that the attitude of the Secretary of State is not one of ignoring the Congress, but, on the other hand, there may be said to be a sincere attitude of complete cooperation with the appropriate committees of the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator has stated it accurately.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have been one of those who have heard from time to time with great interest and appreciation the statements which have been made on the floor by the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY], and I have heard with approval his generous references to the attitude of Senators on the other side of the aisle. However, the inquiry which was made a moment ago by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the history of this body in respect to international agreements leads one to be concerned as to whether or not before we come to the point of decision on these matters we have perfected the machinery and the technique by which we propose to meet them and to handle them. It seems to me that if there is ever going to be any question raised at a subsequent time about whether the Senate has had adequate participation in these matters, the

time to raise the question is now before the deliberations proceed too far.

If, as the elder Senator Lodge ably maintained, the right of the Senate to advise includes the power and the right of the Senate to suggest and to take part in the initial deliberations and discussions, if I understand his theory correctly, and if it is a tenable theory, let us determine it before we ever have the conference and not wait until the delegates depart for their several countries and then insist that the Senate was not adequately represented. Let us determine our course and our theory and the theory of our rights and our duty, and let us advise the executive branch of the Government that we regard our power as a coordinate power not only in the ratification of these international understandings, but in their negotiation, and, having been left out of the negotiation, we feel we have been precluded from our correct and proper part.

In the second place, Mr. President, would it not be wise, if I may venture the suggestion, that the joint committee, which has been well-functioning, work out some proper way of limiting the time in committee and debate on the floor which shall be devoted to these matters, so that we can assure other powers that, within a reasonable time at least, the United States of America shall make a decision one way or the other about the matter.

I think the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Senators on both sides of the aisle would have to agree that as it is, at the present time, neither the President nor the Secretary of State can tell any foreign power or powers when the decision of the United States Government, including the action of the Senate under its power, may be expected upon an international agreement. We certainly should perfect a formula or come to some agreement respecting machinery under which action can be taken, so that no nation or group of nations will have to wait indefinitely upon the action of this branch of the Government as being necessary to the validating of agreements.

The third thing, Mr. President—and the able chairman has been most indulgent, as he always is—if there is going to be a protracted debate upon whether these agreements constitute agreements to be ratified by the Senate and the House of Representatives by majority vote, as opposed to treaties which require two-thirds vote in the Senate, can we not jointly and in a spirit of patriotism and cooperation formulate some standard, some definition, which might establish the line of demarcation between an agreement and a treaty?

Senators well know that there is an agreement now pending in the Foreign Relations Committee, the oil agreement with Great Britain, and Senators know that we shall soon be presented with the report of the monetary conference, but which has not yet come to the committee. They are matters of great importance, and there may be differences of opinion among Senators as to what the procedure with respect to them should be, and how many votes will be required in the Senate for the approval of these

agreements. That will depend upon what we determine to be the character of the agreements.

Mr. President, cannot the joint committee, under the able leadership of our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, begin to devote some attention to that matter, and consult authorities on international law, and take counsel from any worthy source, and let us determine, if we can, that those engagements which do not require a commitment to the exercise of military force on the part of this country may be regarded as agreements, subject to ratification and validation by a majority of the Senate and a majority of the House, while those engagements which would bind this country to an obligation to use force in case of unprovoked attack upon an ally, might well be regarded as treaties, requiring two-thirds vote of the Senate for their ratification?

So, respecting the matter of how many votes it will take for the validity of the instrument to be established in the Congress, respecting the question of how long we will consume in committee and on the floor in consideration and debate, and regarding the very vital matter of the proper place of senatorial representation in the whole matter, respecting those very essential and very vital matters, could not this committee bring together its members, and take counsel from appropriate sources and try to formulate something which will make it possible for the machinery of the United States Government expeditiously and properly to function and in a timely manner to function? Let us do it before it is too late.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his suggestion. We have such a large element of good spirit on both sides of the Chamber for what we hope will be an acceptable structure of peace, that I am sure we will not have any difficulty about the details. However, I shall be glad to keep in mind what the Senator has suggested.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Texas has been good enough to refer to me and others upon this side of the Chamber in most kindly fashion, and I want to express to him my very grateful appreciation of the spirit he has manifested and of the words spoken by him.

Mr. President, out of my observation of parliamentary practice there has come to me the very deep conviction that a legislative committee, whether of the House or of the Senate, never rises above the level of leadership of the chairman of the committee. I think whatever has been accomplished in the way of unity, and whatever of helpful suggestions have come from the Foreign Relations Committee during these late months, may be attributed in substantial part to the kindness, the courtesy, and the tact shown by the Senator from Texas in his

leadership of that committee. He has shown at all times consideration for those of us in the minority. He has shown wisdom, and I think, as is true since he came to the Congress many years ago, he has been motivated at all times by an exalted patriotism.

Mr. President, I have for him profound respect, and I have great confidence that under his leadership greater things will yet be accomplished in the bringing about of this international order for which we all hope.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am sincerely grateful to the Senator from Maine for these generous and kind remarks which have come as an expression of his great heart.

Mr. President, we have had this fine spirit in the committee because of the fact that the Senators I have mentioned, and others on the minority side who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the distinguished members of the majority on that committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and other Senators, all have had no other purpose on earth than a purpose of high patriotism and a desire to bring about a solution, so far as solutions can be obtained at all, of this question of international peace and the prevention of war. Were it not for the cooperation and kindly assistance of these Senators we could not have made progress, but we could very easily have had some classic joint debates, and some very outstandingly sharp differences in the committee and on the floor. It is our purpose to avoid those things.

Mr. President, the preservation of the peace, not simply for ourselves but for all the world, is something which leaps over mountain ranges; it does not stop at international boundaries, it does not stop even at the shore lines of the ocean, but it is something which reaches into the very fundamentals of humanity and humankind. Even if our instrumentality at first may not be perfect—and very few things on this earth are perfect; perfection exists only in another world than this one—even though our instrumentality may not be perfect, yet if we make substantial progress toward diminishing the danger of war and giving security and a promise of peace to the peoples of the earth, we shall achieve as no other legislative body has achieved in all the long and varied centuries that have passed over the hoary head of mother earth. Peace and the preservation of peace for the security of nations is something which is greater than partisan politics. It transcends the little temporary victories or defeats which may occur in this Chamber. It transcends political fortunes of individuals.

Mr. President, we see the lists of casualties from the European battlefields and from the far stretches of the Pacific. The War Department lists the soldier's name, lists his address, lists his organization perhaps, and perhaps it lists the names of his parents, but it does not list whether he is a Republican or

a Democrat. He is fighting for the Republic. He is fighting for his native land. He is fighting for his flag. He is not fighting for any puny political consideration, Democratic or Republican.

So, Mr. President, I hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle, and Members of the House, may continue not alone in their attitude of approaching these problems in a nonpartisan spirit, but I hope they will use their influence and their power upon those who may be inclined to make the question a political one, not to do so, but let the United States of America continue the leadership. We have taken it; let us maintain it. Let us accomplish this great ambition of giving to the world a leadership which shall secure the establishment of peace machinery that shall offer at least a hope to the world that the generations which follow ours shall not be cursed by another bloody, cruel, and tragic war like that which has already devastated so many of the fair lands of Europe and of Asia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me say first that I cordially agree with the able and distinguished Senator from Texas in his dedication to an unpartisan approach to this tremendously vital achievement which is so desperately essential to civilization. I take it this does not suggest that candid public discussion of the subject should be foreclosed. On the contrary, I take it, that, as President Wilson once said, we should seek open covenants openly arrived at, and that it is to the best welfare of the Nation that the problems of foreign policy should be laid frankly before the American people and discussed frankly out of the heart of our high leadership, so long as the objective is the welfare of our common undertaking.

Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] has said about the work of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I know of no experience in my 16 years in the Senate when there have been more generous, broad-minded, and tolerant efforts to find a unity of purpose at all times, regardless of partisan politics. I join in thanking him for his observations regarding whatever contributions we have been able to make from this side of the aisle in the same spirit.

I rise particularly, however, Mr. President, because of an implication in the suggestions made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who seems to feel that we have already reached the point where we can leap ahead to the creation of a timetable which will foreshorten this entire enterprise and produce a quick net result. I think he suggested that if anyone has any difference of opinion regarding what is going on, he ought to express it now, and not later.

Mr. President, I believe there is no fundamental difference of opinion regarding the objective. I think perhaps there is some difference of opinion among us as to the precise method which shall be pursued in arriving at that goal. In view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida I wish to take this occasion very briefly to lay down three or four fundamental points which will be

my own continuous impulse in my continuing effort in connection with this great and vital adventure.

The first thing I wish to say is that, in my view, if this foreshortened world cannot organize a permanent peace, then the murderous ingenuity of modern military science will make an end to our civilization in the next world war; and only those who are blind to these blasting realities, only those who can be complacent in the presence of global suicide, will fail to make every practical effort to organize the peace of this earth against any such calamity. To that objective I dedicate every prayer of my heart and every effort of my remaining years.

Next, Mr. President, I wish to say that, from my point of view, it is too obvious for argument that this objective requires sound international organization to encourage the concord of good will; to stimulate moral and spiritual, as well as physical defenses; to establish organized justice under effective international law as a substitute for force; to create the mechanisms which shall exhaust the rules of reason before there shall be appeals to might; and ultimately, if all these fail, to mobilize the military cooperation which shall defend the conscience of the world.

Third, I wish to say that at the threshold of this aspiration it is equally obvious that the world's criminals of today must be so permanently demilitarized that they can never become the criminals of tomorrow. To that end the immediate and continuous availability of Allied force is indispensable. This is elementary prudence. It is clearly the primary military responsibility of the four major powers. It is a temporary military alliance for a specific and limited purpose, as distinguished from a permanent alliance. Even George Washington, the great, original foe of entangled Americanism, recognized such temporary alliances as wholly legitimate. There must be no such complacency, in softer years to come, in respect to this repressive phase of the problem as was largely responsible for Hitler's sinister violation of Versailles, with the expedient and inexplicable and negligent consent of his subsequent victims.

Now, Mr. President, we come to the question as to the part which military force shall play in the ultimate authority of this international organization which is to be charged with responsibility for the peace of the world. Let there be no doubt about my view that force, as a last resort, shall never be out of sight or out of mind or out of mutual reach. Military force will always have to be the answer to those who understand no other argument. But there can be deeply conscientious differences of honest opinion in respect to the inherent relative importance of military force in this equation.

I am one of those who do not believe that our greatest hope for peace lies in trying to put peace in a steel strait jacket. I believe that our greatest hope lies in adequate mechanisms to develop reason and justice in international affairs, which shall be predominately accepted by enlightened peoples—backed always, I repeat, by constant vigilance

against mobilizations of aggressive power. In other words, I doubt whether any hard and fast international contracts looking toward the automatic use of cooperative force in unforeseeable emergencies ahead will be worth any more, when the time comes, than the national consciences of the contracting parties when the hour of acid test arrives. In whatever degree this is correct, our final reliance, even in the mobilization of military force—which, of course, must be available finally—will depend upon the justice of the cause and the peace conscience of the world.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I believe that a just peace, in the first instance, is the indispensable beginning of this great adventure, because in my view a good league cannot cure a bad peace, either now or hereafter. It is for this reason that I like those words in the Republican national platform, if I may refer to it not in a partisan sense but in a historical sense—words which have been amazingly misunderstood—which pledge the use of peace forces to stop the aggressors of tomorrow. Peace forces means to me whatever force—moral, diplomatic, economic, or military—is necessary to keep the peace whenever the emergency arises. In my humble view, the first three of these forces are likely to be more useful than the last, although the last must never be ignored and must never be unavailable.

Let me add a final word to this swift summary. I want my country to play her full, legitimate, and effective role in this evolution out of recurrent world savagery. I believe she can play her greatest role by remaining always and forever the free, sovereign, and independent United States of America. I believe that her voice will always be the most disinterested and judicial voice in the concerts of the world; and such a voice should never be muted. I believe that we can collaborate wholeheartedly in building up the "peace forces" which shall minimize, and probably prevent, another World War tragedy; and I have no thought that we have parted with any essential sovereignty when, for example, we ourselves recognize justiciable issues in a greatly broadened and strengthened international law which we ourselves have helped to write, and which we approve.

I have the profound conviction that if this international machinery is adequately created to implement a just peace, and again I emphasize the adjective, and if the major powers strive faithfully to organize and support these "peace forces" of the earth, any pirate of tomorrow who defies this process will be so clearly criminal in character and so clearly due for physical restraint that there will be no default, on the part of ourselves or of any others, in the united, voluntary military action which will produce invincible repression.

Mr. President, that, in a general quick summary, indicates my feeling about this tremendously important subject. I think it ought to be plain that the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee, to which considerable reference has been

made, in its conferences at the State Department has dealt solely with the question of international organization for peace. It has had no approach to the considerations involved in the writing of the terms of the peace itself. That has been outside our jurisdiction thus far. If there has been any sort of difference of opinion among Senators, the great difference has been over the inability of some of us to separate our conception of the international machinery which we are attempting to create from the type and character of the peace itself—the type of a post-war status quo which our organization in the first instance must underwrite and undertake to sustain. My own very deep conviction, I repeat, is that we cannot separate the possibility of final and conclusive success for our organization from the justice and the equity of the peace agreement which in the first instance it must undertake to administer.

But in the present temper of the American people and in the present approach which is being made to this subject throughout the country, if we will just credit good faith to those who want to publicly discuss the subject, I know of no reason why we should not proceed to a net result which will be a benediction on the world. I do not think there is any disadvantage in full public discussion, so long as it is well-founded and proceeds in good faith. On the contrary, I think that in the last year or two our chief difficulty has been a lack of adequate public information about some phases of the problem—a lack of information which inevitably invites gossip and rumor and speculation—a lack of information particularly regarding post-war understandings at Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, and Teheran.

Under the existing circumstances, particularly in the light of what is a very recent accord between high spokesmen for political parties in the United States respecting a mutual desire to achieve this goal, in my view the conference at Dumbarton Oaks meets under the happiest possible promise of good effect.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, first I wish to say that I am very happy about the remarks which have been made by various Senators. I especially approve what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said about public discussion of these all-important questions. I think we should have public discussion. I think every man in public life should have convictions on this great subject, and should express his convictions. So I am quite happy about the discussion.

There was one matter, however, in the course of the remarks of the Senator from Michigan which disturbed me just a little, and I wish to propound to him a question relating to it, to see whether I correctly understood him. In the course of his remarks the Senator from Michigan more than once referred to a world organization implementing the peace. His words indicated, to my mind, that perhaps the Senator from Michigan thought we should postpone discussions of such a world organization until after the peace is finally agreed

upon. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Michigan whether I misunderstood him in that respect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for asking me the question, especially if there could be the slightest doubt or implication in connection with my previous remarks. My answer to him regarding postponement of all these discussions is emphatically "No." The planning of the world peace organization should proceed at a maximum speed to a conclusion as early as circumstances and events will permit.

What I said, or at least what I meant to say, was that those who in the future must make the final decisions respecting the international organization, I think should also be highly and intimately informed, concurrently, regarding the thinking of these governments in respect to the kind of a peace which is contemplated; because, I repeat, I think there are more possible germs of future disaster in the wrong kind of a peace than there are in even the wrong kind of a league. I think the subjects are inseparable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that perhaps the question arose in my mind, not as a result of what he said, but from my own lack of understanding. But I am very glad that I asked the question, and I am deeply gratified at the explanation the Senator has given. Of course, it is in accord with my view.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make very sure that I am correctly understood. I am not one of those who think this new instrumentality should be used as the one to make the peace. I am entirely in disagreement with any such view. I think the two functions are totally unrelated.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, let me say that I know of no one who does not take that view.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—REAM GENERAL HOSPITAL (FORMERLY THE BREAKERS HOTEL) (PT. 19 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, in December of 1942, the War Department acquired the Breakers Hotel, in Palm Beach, one of America's famous luxury hotels. The hotel was taken for use as a station hospital. After about 4½ months' use, during which only a small portion of the beds were filled, the Air Corps, who were operating the station hospital, decided they had no further use for it. The hospital was then transferred to the Surgeon General for use as a general hospital, known as the Ream General Hospital. After a few more months the War Department announced that it was abandoning the Breakers Hotel. There was considerable public discussion of this, as a result of which an investigation was undertaken by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

After an investigation, including the examination of witnesses on the ground the committee arrived at the following conclusions:

The Breakers should never have been acquired. The War Department seriously underestimated its fair rental cost. It was the most expensive hotel property in the vicinity. Its advantages over other similar first-class hotels in the vicinity were primarily in luxuries.

The manner of acquisition, as in the case of other hotel properties in the Florida area, was high-handed and arbitrary. The officers in charge of the take-over acted on very short notice with practically no consideration for the owners, whereas they should have been able to give the owners sufficient notice. This occurred in many other hotel acquisitions as well. The officers in charge for the Army valued the hotel entirely too low. The owners feel an attempt was made to force them to accept these valuations by indicating that it would be unpatriotic to try to get a fair return. Other instances of similar attempts appeared in other Florida hotel acquisitions. The owners had the financial ability to resist and because of such ability they will receive a rent which is exactly twice what was first offered.

After the Breakers had been discontinued as a station hospital the decision to convert it into a general hospital was proper. The large structure had been practically empty during most of the time it was used as a station hospital. Rent and large renovation charges had been incurred. By using this very desirable property as a general hospital, the Government provided what the Surgeon General termed "a model institution," and at the same time proceeded to get something for its money.

The original decision to abandon the Breakers was made with insufficient consideration. A second decision affirming the original one was made 4 months later, after a detailed study of the question by a board of officers. As shown below this decision was not justified by the facts.

The Breakers should not have been abandoned at this time in view of the large financial obligation which was incurred. Representatives of the Surgeon General have testified that the Breakers is an excellent hospital. It has been characterized by the Surgeon General as one of his best general hospitals, and a model institution. The testimony before this committee is that the beds in the Breakers Hospital could be used. The facility itself and its location were excellent. The reasons given for its abandonment are not convincing. It appears that the property was abandoned because the War Department discovered it to have been a very poor original transaction, which resulted in a property which was bound to be too expensive. The loss would be incurred, whether or not the property was returned. The cost of keeping the property, over and above the cost of returning it, was moderate. However, pressure from civilian groups to return the Breakers Hotel, added to the fact that the entire property, taken as a whole, was a poor original investment apparently prompted the War Department to return it.

In order fully to appreciate the War Department's position in connection with the Breakers, the committee carefully

surveyed the entire hospital programs of all of the armed services, and of the Veterans' Administration. We found that none of the other services could use the Breakers Hotel. This should have been known before the Breakers was ever acquired. Unfortunately it was not.

The committee's last conclusion is as follows:

Prior to March 31, 1943, there was no coordination of the hospital programs of the various agencies. As a result, the Breakers was acquired without consultation with any of the other agencies which might have been able to utilize excess army hospitals in suitable locations. Despite the fact that on March 31, 1943, the President ordered the War Department to consult the Federal Board of Hospitalization, organized in 1924 for the purpose, the War Department did not consult the Board about the conversion to a general hospital or before the original decision was made to abandon the Breakers. After controversy had arisen, the Board was finally consulted on the abandonment.

Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I submit the report and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, and without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (pt. 19 of Rept. No. 10) is as follows:

REAM GENERAL HOSPITAL, FORMERLY THE
BREAKERS HOTEL

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. The Breakers should never have been acquired. The War Department seriously underestimated its fair rental cost. It was the most expensive hotel property in the vicinity. Its advantages over other similar first-class hotels in the vicinity were primarily in luxuries.

2. The manner of acquisition, as in the case of other hotel properties in the Florida area, was high-handed and arbitrary. The officers in charge of the take-over acted on very short notice with practically no consideration for the owners, whereas they should have been able to give the owners sufficient notice. This occurred in many other hotel acquisitions as well. The officers in charge for the Army valued the hotel entirely too low. The owners feel an attempt was made to force them to accept these valuations by indicating that it would be unpatriotic to try to get a fair return. Other instances of similar attempts appeared in other Florida hotel acquisitions. The owners had the financial ability to resist and because of such ability they will receive a rent which is exactly twice what was first offered.

3. After the Breakers had been discontinued as a station hospital the decision to convert it into a general hospital was proper. The large structure had been practically empty during most of the time it was used as a station hospital. Rent and large renovation charges had been incurred. By using this very desirable property as a general hospital, the Government provided what the Surgeon General termed "a model institution," and at the same time proceeded to get something for its money.

4. The original decision to abandon the Breakers was made with insufficient consideration. A second decision affirming the original one was made 4 months later, after a detailed study of the question by a board

of officers. As shown below this decision was not justified by the facts.

5. The Breakers should not have been abandoned at this time in view of the large financial obligation which was incurred. Representatives of the Surgeon General have testified that the Breakers is an excellent hospital. It has been characterized by the Surgeon General as one of his best general hospitals, and a "model institution." The testimony before this committee is that the beds in the Breakers Hospital could be used. The facility itself and its location were excellent. The reasons given for its abandonment are not convincing. It appears that the property was abandoned because the War Department discovered it to have been a very poor original transaction, which resulted in a property which was bound to be too expensive. The loss would be incurred whether or not the property was returned. The cost of keeping the property, over and above the cost of returning it, was moderate. However, pressure from civilian groups to return the Breakers Hotel, added to the fact that the entire property, taken as a whole, was a poor original investment apparently prompted the War Department to return it.

6. In order to provide sufficient additional general hospital beds, when the Breakers was abandoned, a barracks type of hospital was placed into operation at Camp Atterbury, Ind. The location and general construction of this hospital does not compare with the Breakers.

7. If used for a redistribution center or a hospital, the Breakers could be operated at costs comparable to those of any of the hotel properties now being acquired, provided it did not charge against the cost of its operation the loss which will be incurred whether or not the property is retained. The committee has not been advised of any convincing reason why the Breakers would not be suitable for a redistribution center.

8. Prior to March 31, 1943, there was no coordination of the hospital programs of the various agencies. As a result, the Breakers was acquired without consultation with any of the other agencies which might have been able to utilize excess Army hospitals in suitable locations. Despite the fact that on March 31, 1943, the President ordered the War Department to consult the Federal Board of Hospitalization, organized in 1924 for the purpose, the War Department did not consult the Board about the conversion to a general hospital or before the original decision was made to abandon the Breakers. After controversy had arisen, the Board was finally consulted on the abandonment.

9. The War Department's statements of facts in connection with this entire matter do not appear to be accurate. For instance, the cost per bed stated by the Engineer Corps to the Surgeon General on the basis of which the Surgeon General agreed to relinquish the hotel was far in excess of later War Department estimates. Another instance is in the Engineer Corps' bed estimate of a fair rental for the property. Another is in the statements made to this committee. In a letter dated August 16, 1944, the War Department advised this committee that unless the work of reconverting the Breakers to a hotel were begun by August 21, the alterations could not be finished on December 10, when the War Department intends to return the hotel to its owners. This was stated in order to induce this committee to complete its investigation. But on April 26, 1944, the War Department advised this committee that the Breakers could be used as a hospital until September 1 and that there would still be ample time for reconversion. And the board of officers appointed by the War Department to consider the abandonment of the Breakers concluded, on the basis of positive testimony before them, that the reconversion could be completed in 2 months, including the reinstallation of the hotel furnishings. The

report of the board of officers on the abandonment of the Breakers contains many self-contradictions.

THE ACQUISITION OF THE BREAKERS HOTEL

The Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach, Fla., owned by the Florida East Coast Hotel Co., is considered one of the finest luxury hotels in America. It is a 500-room, 9-story structure with a number of large cottages, spacious grounds, and considerable ocean frontage.

In the summer of 1942 a survey was made of various buildings in Florida suitable for Army hospital use. On September 16, 1942, the Breakers Hotel was surveyed for this purpose. On this date the Breakers made inquiry of the Surgeon General's Office, through proper Government channels, and were advised that the Surgeon General's Office did not think they would be interested in Palm Beach. Nothing further occurred until September 30, when another inspection of the hotel was made by the War Department. Then nothing further occurred until November 20 when still another inspection was made.

In the meantime the owner made plans and entered into the necessary advertising arrangements, and made commitments for the employment of a staff and for other necessities with the intention of opening the hotel as usual on December 15, 1942. This was at the request of the civic authorities at Palm Beach who had urged the continued operation of the Breakers Hotel.

On December 4, 1942, the owners received a telegram to have their representative stand by with respect to the possible leasing of the hotel. This was the first information the owners had that the War Department had any intention of taking over the hotel. Prior to that there had merely been inspections of a type which had been made of practically every hotel in the Florida area. By December 4 the entire operating staff at the hotel were on the premises and arrangements to open the hotel on December 15 were well under way.

On December 7, 1942, another inspection was made and the War Department telegraphed the owners that the Government desired occupancy of the hotel. Negotiations took place on December 8 in New York, which was a Tuesday, and the officer in charge told the owners that the War Department would have to obtain possession of the premises by Thursday morning of that week, the 10th of December. On Friday morning, December 11, the War Department obtained a court order giving them possession starting December 12, 1942.

Over 90 guests were expected to arrive at the hotel on the following Tuesday, December 15. All the employees were on the job, and had contracts. There were over \$400,000 worth of reservations booked, which was only about \$50,000 below normal.

At this time there were at least two other hotels in Palm Beach which were not opening for the season beginning December 15, 1942. They were first-class hotels, one just about the size of the Breakers, the other two-thirds of its size. There was also available for use by the armed forces in West Palm Beach at that time a civilian hospital which had 200 beds and which could have been expanded to 1,200. This hospital was offered to the Navy Department and certainly could have been obtained by the War Department.

The officer in charge for the Army offered \$200,000 a year rent for the premises, before the condemnation proceedings were instituted. His manner has been characterized by the owners as arbitrary. This is in complete agreement with the statement received by the committee concerning this officer from practically every hotel owner with whom he dealt in the Florida area. The management was told "you can take it or leave it." The

management was told very strongly that public opinion would brand them as unpatriotic if they went to court in an effort to get a higher rent. It should be pointed out at this time that in a tentative agreement between the United States Government and the hotel management, for the return of the hotel to the owners the rent has been fixed at \$400,000 a year. The present rent includes minor portions of the entire Breakers property in addition to that originally taken. However, the original offer was for the basic hotel and some of the surrounding property and buildings, without which the property which was subsequently taken, was entirely valueless to the owners. Moreover, the additional property taken represented only a small portion of the whole. There is no reason to doubt that the \$400,000 rental figure is a fair figure. The Breakers was an extremely profitable and valuable hotel.

The officer in charge of the negotiations told the manager of the Breakers that the Government's haste was due to an immediate demand for facilities because a large number of wounded were expected to be evacuated from Africa. Actually the premises were not used as a hospital of any kind until March 1, 1943, when they were opened as a station hospital, with a capacity of 1,038 beds. In March there were an average of 32 occupied beds, in April an average of 29, in May an average of 127, in June an average of 221, in July an average of 200. According to the Army's own statement, "the Army Air Forces offered the Breakers Hotel to the Surgeon General for use as a general hospital on July 19, 1943, when it became apparent that reduction of Army Air Forces personnel in Florida and failure of overseas evacuations to develop made it unnecessary to retain this facility as a station hospital."

As of July 19 an obligation almost undoubtedly had been incurred to pay a full year's rent, or \$400,000 as now agreed. Two hundred and ninety-nine thousand dollars had been invested to convert the premises to a hospital. Substantially the same amount would have to be invested to convert it back to a hotel. The total is \$998,000, and after only 4½ months of partial use the Army Air Forces, which had originally taken the hotel, was through with it. As of this point, the total number of patients was 661 and the average number of beds occupied was 122, or a cost for providing the building alone, of over \$3,000 for each bed occupied.

TRANSFER OF THE HOSPITAL TO THE SURGEON GENERAL

On July 30, 1943, the Surgeon General recommended that the hospital be made available as a general hospital. On September 10, the Surgeon General assumed jurisdiction over the Breakers Hotel and operated it at a capacity of 1,038 beds. It was called the Ream General Hospital. On September 3, the Surgeon General requested alterations, modifications, and acquisition of additional grounds around the hotel, which, after modification would have totaled approximately \$400,000. This final sum was approved by the Army Service Forces on November 11, 1943. As late as December 4, 1943, at the request of the War Department, the Department of Justice obtained a court order in condemnation for the immediate possession of additional ground around the hotel. This order was never served because on the same day, 2 hours after the order was signed, the War Department changed its mind and instructed the Attorney General that it did not want the land. However, on December 4, 1943, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styer advised the hotel owners that the Chief of Engineers had been instructed to negotiate further with respect to leasing the property, and on December 6 General Styer advised the hotel owners that a study was being made of the requirements for additional land in connection with the

Breakers Hotel, and that pending the completion of the study the War Department would refrain from seeking this lease by condemnation.

In the meantime, however, the War Department had concluded "that it had become evident that an excessive rental as well as expensive alterations would be entailed." It had begun to reconsider the desirability of this property in the light of a directive of the Under Secretary of War on November 16 that all rental real estate be surveyed and that all such property not actually needed be released.

On January 8, 1944, Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Army Service Forces, wrote to Mr. William R. Kenan, president, Florida East Coast Hotel Co., the owners of the Breakers, as follows:

"This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 30, 1943, in which you request information as to whether or not the War Department intends to continue the use of the Breakers Hotel, West Palm Beach, Fla., as a general hospital.

"It has now been decided that as soon as arrangements can be made for removal of the patients now at this hospital, the Breakers Hotel will be returned to its owners. The Chief of Engineers has been instructed to accomplish this transfer and will contact you directly."

THE DECISION TO ABANDON THE BREAKERS

The major reasons given for the abandonment of the Breakers are the following:

1. Excessive cost as determined by the Chief of Engineers. This item was easily determinable before the Breakers was taken.
2. A general decision to give up rental properties in favor of purchased property wherever possible. The only application to hospitals of this alleged general rule was in the case of the Breakers Hotel. No other hospital was given up on this basis. Moreover, the Breakers could have been purchased.

3. A determination that there were too many general hospitals in the southern part of the country and not enough in the northern part of the country, in view of the distribution of population. As a result of this determination, no other hospitals in the South were closed other than the Breakers.

This committee has asked the War Department for all documents bearing in any way upon the decision to abandon the Breakers Hotel. The first document of any kind indicating that the abandonment of the hotel was contemplated is an office memorandum to the Surgeon General on the subject of a conference concerning the Ream General Hospital.

This conference took place December 13, 1943. The Surgeon General's position was the following:

- (a) That minimum necessary changes be made to convert the Breakers into a suitable general hospital.

- (b) That additional land, then available, be purchased to provide exercise space for convalescent patients.

- (c) That the Surgeon General would favorably entertain a proposal to give up the property, in view of the Chief of Engineers' statement that the cost was excessive, together with "the repeated strong efforts of certain civilian agencies to prevent the acquisition of this hotel as an Army general hospital, provided that suitable general hospital beds be made available as a substitute, that there be no delay in making final decision, and that the Breakers be retained as a general hospital until such time as other suitable facilities be made available."

The Real Estate Branch and the Construction Branch of the Office of the Chief of Engineers stated at the conference that over a 5-year period the Breakers would cost approximately \$3,572 per bed on a rental basis

without equity, and that on a purchase basis the property would cost approximately \$4,561 per bed.

It was agreed at the conference that action to consider acquisition of the hotel property and pending alterations would be postponed for 10 days pending a proposal to turn over a 2-story, semipermanent, brick, 2,200-bed station hospital at Camp Atterbury, Ind., as a general hospital to be used in place of the Breakers Hotel property. It was agreed that if, after a period of 10 days, the hospital at Camp Atterbury or some other similar hospital acceptable to the Surgeon General could not be declared available within a reasonable period, then immediate steps would be taken to acquire the additional land and to make the minimum alterations to convert the Breakers into a suitable general hospital according to plans which had been approved by the Surgeon General and the Chief of Engineers.

The committee has not been furnished with any memoranda upon which the above decisions were made and, therefore, must assume that none exists.

A memorandum dated December 8 to the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3, from the Deputy Director for Plans and Operations of the Army Service Forces, stated that a reasonable rental would be \$400,000 a year, that to date \$275,000 had been expended for alterations, that an additional \$475,000 would have to be spent for alterations and the purchase of additional land, and that cost of restoration to the hotel after additional alterations would be approximately \$1,000,000.

This memorandum also stated that "considerable pressure is being brought upon the War Department by the Florida East Coast Railroad, owners of the hotel, to have it returned for their use. However, it is essential that the 1,200 hospital beds provided by this hotel be available for general hospital use."

The memorandum goes on to state that if station hospitals located at either Camp Edwards or Camp Atterbury can be vacated that they can be used as general hospitals in place of the Breakers. The memorandum concludes:

"As there is a very pressing need for additional general hospital beds and as negotiations are now under way to determine the annual rental of the hotel and the additional land required to complete the general hospital, it is requested that a decision be expedited."

On December 29, the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, directed that on or about March 1, 1944, the station hospital at Camp Atterbury be designated as a general hospital and that upon occupation of this hospital the Breakers Hotel be released to its owners.

On January 5, General Somervell advised the Chief of Engineers that the Secretary of War had directed that Camp Atterbury be designated as a general hospital and that the Breakers be released to its owners.

Thereafter there was considerable public discussion concerning the release of the hotel. In the meantime the Department of Justice had been asked to take over negotiations for the settlement of the legal controversy, and the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division at the request of the commanding general of the Army Service Forces made a study of the subject. The Assistant Attorney General recommended that from the legal and financial viewpoint it would be extravagant to relinquish the property because the additional expenditures which would have to be made to acquire title to the premises would be comparatively small in view of the considerable expense which would be involved whether or not the property were relinquished. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division forwarded his report to the War Department on March 14, 1944, and on March 25, 1944, the

commanding general of the Army Service Forces wrote to the Assistant Attorney General that he did not feel that acquisition in fee of the property could be justified and therefore requested that the Assistant Attorney General proceed with the settlement of the pending litigation.

In the meantime this committee had asked both the War Department and the Department of Justice for information concerning the hotel. The Attorney General refused to produce the Assistant Attorney General's report until after a subpoena for its production was issued by this committee. The War Department then convened a board of officers, who, on April 20, 1944, submitted a voluminous report in which they recommended the abandonment of the property not later than December 10, 1944. The Commanding General of the Army Service Forces informed this committee the property would be used as a hospital until September 1, 1944, after which it would be restored to its former condition as a hotel and returned to the owner by December 14.

During the first week of August the committee learned that the premises had been completely vacated by July 20 and that a stipulation was about to be filed which would in effect turn the property over to the owner and finally settle the litigation. The committee proceeded immediately to hold hearings and obtain all available information on the subject.

The War Department's principal reason for abandoning the Breakers Hotel appears to be the question of cost. Apparently the War Department's position on this subject has never been clear. It must originally have been thought that the cost would not be excessive. Otherwise it would not have determined to rent the hotel. Its statements on the subject are conflicting. From the memorandum of December 14, referred to above, it appears that the Surgeon General was advised by the Corps of Engineers that the cost of the property on a leased basis over a 5-year period would be approximately \$3,572 per bed. But in a memorandum to the Under Secretary of War, dated January 31, 1944, the Commanding General of the Army Service Forces stated that the cost per bed on a 5-year-lease basis would be \$2,100 on the basis of the Government's estimate of the proper rent. The commanding general added:

"The feeling is shared, however, by the Chief of Engineers, the Surgeon General, and this headquarters that court action would be favorable to a much higher rental than that estimated by the Government. The cost per bed might amount to as much as \$3,100."

In a report on the expense of operating the Breakers submitted to the board of officers investigating the abandonment of the hotel, Maj. Gen. A. H. Carter of the Army Service Forces stated that the cost per bed on initial construction of the Breakers would be \$3,730, if the purchase price were \$4,000,000, and \$3,094, if the purchase price were \$3,200,000. Again it appears that the Surgeon General was misinformed, according to the memorandum of December 14, 1943, when he was told that on a purchase basis the property would cost approximately \$4,564 per bed.

Moreover cost per bed based on a \$3,200,000 purchase price would appear to be the more reasonable. This is the figure given by the Department of Justice, which has much more experience in the field, and it appears to have been fairly accurate in its estimates concerning the proper rental value. The War Department's estimate of \$4,000,000 should be viewed in the light of the proven inability of the War Department to estimate the probable rental. However, even the \$3,094 cost per bed estimated by the War Department on the basis of a \$3,200,000 cost is much too high.

It would be a proper figure if the question were whether to acquire the hotel today and the hotel had not actually been taken in

1942. As of today the question is not how much it would cost to buy the hotel. The true question is how much it will cost to buy the hotel over and above any sum which must be spent whether or not the hotel is purchased. Thus if the hotel is purchased for \$3,200,000, the total cost of acquisition would be:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Cost of all property, including interest from original date of taking | \$3,490,000 |
| Cost of converting to station hospital | 299,000 |
| Additional cost of converting to general hospital | 400,000 |
| War Department's estimate of cost of converting from general hospital to hotel | 375,000 |
| Total | 4,564,000 |

* Another War Department estimate gives this figure as \$1,000,000, but this is entirely too high.

But if the proceedings are settled as now intended by the War Department, it will have cost the Government:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Rent for 2 years | \$800,000 |
| Cost of converting to a station hospital | 299,000 |
| Cost of converting to a hotel | 311,200 |
| Total | 1,410,200 |

This \$1,410,200 will have to be spent if the Government returns the hotel and, as of December 11, 1944, has no interest in the property at all.

To own the property will therefore cost the Government only \$3,153,800 more than must be spent in any event.

But from this \$3,153,800 must be subtracted the probable return from resale, at \$3,200,000, less an annual decrease in value of \$150,000. Handling this exactly as it is handled in the War Department's own computations, the return after 5 years' use would be \$2,450,000. Therefore, the total cost for 5 years' use would be \$3,153,800 less \$2,450,000, or \$703,800. Since 2 of the 5 years have elapsed (and must be paid for in any event) the cost per year for 3 more years would be \$234,600.

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division, Department of Justice, believes that the petition to take the property in condemnation could be amended to take title from the original date of taking possession.

Therefore, the cost per bed would be about \$185 per year, on a basis of 1,260 beds, which is the number of beds the War Department uses in its calculations. War Department figures on maintenance and repair costs are conflicting. At one point of the board of officers report this figure is given as \$167 per bed per year. At another point it is stated as \$203 per bed per year, each on the basis of 1,038 beds. The set of figures estimating \$203 gives an estimate of \$207 per bed per year on the basis of 1,260 beds. Therefore, it appears that increasing the number of beds would not increase this cost. Taking \$167, the annual cost per day is \$167 plus \$185, which is \$352, or just under \$1 cost per day.

These figures should be compared with a daily cost per bed for hotels now being rented for use as redistribution centers of from \$1.28 to \$1.72 and even higher.

They also compare favorably with the costs of other rented hotels over 3-year periods. Of five listed in the board of officers' report, two show higher costs per bed per year, and three are lower. The average cost per bed per year of Navy hospitals in the southeastern United States is \$334 per year, only \$18 less.

The cost of acquisition, without considering resale would be \$3,153,800 less the cost of reconverting to a hotel on resale of \$375,000, or \$2,778,800. This amounts to \$2,205 per bed. This compares favorably with cost

of \$2,397 per bed for other hospitals constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the South Atlantic Division. The cost per bed of a great many general hospitals is higher than that of the Breakers.

The memorandum of December 14 of the Medical Corps, following its conference with the Army Service Forces and the Engineer Corps, indicates that the sole reason for agreeing to abandon the Breakers was the representations made to the Medical Corps that the cost of the Breakers was excessive.

The Surgeon General considered the Breakers an excellent hotel. In a letter dated November 18, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styre, of the Army Service Forces, stated:

"The Surgeon General considers the Breakers one of his best general hospitals and has planned to occupy this facility for the duration of the war and for such a period thereafter as may be necessary to take care of the sick and wounded."

In a memorandum dated July 19, 1943, Brig. Gen. N. W. Grant, air surgeon, stated:

"(a) That the hospital be designated to care for cases requiring specialized treatment in plastic surgery, maxillofacial surgery, ophthalmological surgery, and neurosurgery. (It is believed that a large percentage of cases requiring plastic surgery are Air Force personnel.)"

"4. The rehabilitation center in Miami, Fla., will work in close collaboration with this hospital. Their nearness to each other will materially cut down on rail traffic involved in the transfer of patients."

"5. I visualize this hospital as a model institution, bringing together the thoughts of both offices on medical care, and ironing out many apparent differences that have existed for many years."

In a memorandum dated July 30, 1943, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, stated to the commanding general of the Army Service Forces:

"1. It is recommended that the station hospital (1,038 beds) now operated by the United States Army Air Forces in the Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach, Fla., be taken over and operated as an Army general hospital to serve the Florida area and to receive patients through the overseas flyway."

"Minimal structural changes have been made, and having been made, this hotel has become a hospital most compact and simple to administer. It would be hard to find a building not originally built as a hospital that so admirably lends itself to hospital purposes. In fact, its physical construction is such that it is better for hospital use than many hospitals and far superior in design and simplicity to our planned cantonment and general hospitals. Equipment and supplies complete as is and in addition a complete 1,000-bed unit in storage which has been very little used."

The unanimous opinion of many doctors, residents of Palm Beach, relatives of servicemen and patients at the hospital, and of others who have seen the hotel is that it is an excellent facility, particularly for the treatment of plastic surgery cases and for neurosurgery. Its surroundings are ideal from the point of view of morale.

The Camp Atterbury, Ind., station hospital was named as a general hospital in place of the Breakers. The committee report on Camp Atterbury, Ind., to which an investigator was sent, indicates that Camp Atterbury is located in Indiana in a climate which, of course, is not similar to the climate of Palm Beach, Fla. Camp Atterbury, Ind., was never regarded as being in a resort or vacation area. The hospital buildings are two-story, semipermanent, cantonment-type barracks. The facilities for visitors to Camp Atterbury are extremely limited, certainly much more limited than those at Palm Beach or West Palm Beach, Fla., which were reported by a member of the staff of the Corps of Army

Engineers to be entirely satisfactory although expensive in the winter. Winter expense, of course, would be subject to control by the Office of Price Administration.

The committee's investigator was able to interview two patients who had been at Ream General and were then at Camp Atterbury. These patients' homes were in Birmingham, Ala., and in Tampa, Fla. This appears strange in view of statements made to the committee that one of the purposes of abandoning the Breakers was to place patients nearer their homes. These patients stated that Ream General Hospital was an ideal place and they preferred it to Camp Atterbury. The patients referred in particular to treatments in the open air given and appreciated at the Ream General Hospital. Whether or not they have therapeutic value they do have morale value.

Even if the Breakers were not used as a hospital, it would be as inexpensive to operate as a redistribution center as the many hotels now being acquired for that purpose. It creates maladjustments in the economy to take one hotel at the same time another is returned to civilian use, unless there are very good reasons for rejecting the one already in the Government's possession. Too many properties have been taken by the War Department and given up after very short use. Some of them should have been known in advance to be unsuitable. One large hotel in the Miami Beach area was returned within a few months after it had been taken, when it was found to be a fire hazard. This should have been known before the hotel was taken.

While the committee does not desire at any time to review decisions which relate particularly to the questions of the most desirable location for operations, such as hospitals and redistribution centers, the committee is of the opinion that in the absence of compelling reasons against the use of the Breakers, this hotel should not be returned to civilian use at this time. It is extraordinary that at the same time that the War Department particularly bemoans what it alleges to be a slackening of morale on the home front, it is willing to return to luxury use one of the most ideally located hospitals available to injured soldiers. Even though only a few of the many soldiers could enjoy these premises, it boosts the morale of every soldier to know that such premises are available to him and his comrades. While no soldier would have thought much of the matter one way or another if the Breakers had never been taken, many will find it hard to understand why it should be returned. In this connection a very vital aspect of the proposed agreement to return the hotel is that the War Department is to rehabilitate the premises itself. The owners explained to the committee that this is necessary because the owners could not obtain the necessary materials, whereas the War Department can obtain them from its military supplies not available to civilians generally. This results in giving a priority for such things as linens, paint, other materials, and even telephones and electrical wire, to a civilian operation of the most luxurious sort, which in addition to being completely a luxury facility, operates only 4 months of the year. There are many necessary civilian requirements for these same materials which in addition to being non-luxury needs, would be utilized every day of the year.

COORDINATION OF HOSPITAL PROGRAM

Prior to March 31, 1943, there was no coordination of the hospital programs of the various agencies. In 1924 a Federal Board of Hospitalization had been created, but this had never operated effectively. As a result, when the armed services began to acquire hospitals in large numbers for the present war, it became evident that much confusion and duplication would result. Accordingly, on March 31, 1943, the President ordered all of the services to report their

hospital acquisitions and arrangements to the Federal Board of Hospitalization for the purpose of coordination. On March 31, 1943, the President wrote to the Secretary of War that he was "concerned about the lack of coordination and integration of the wartime expansion of Federal hospitals with the existing Federal hospital facilities and with some over-all plan for meeting the post-war requirements for hospitalizing the veterans of this war."

Prior to this time, the Army had acquired the Breakers Hotel without any reference to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. Even subsequent to this time the Army converted the Breakers from a station hospital to a general hospital without any reference to this Board. Even later, the Army decided to abandon the Ream Hospital and issued orders to this effect on January 7, 1944, without any reference to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. In fact, the Army did not consult either the Navy or the Veterans' Administration to see if either of these agencies could use the Breakers Hotel until after the owners were notified that the hotel would be returned on January 8, 1944.

Thereafter, when a public clamor had arisen against the return of the Breakers to civilian ownership, the War Department consulted the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration to see if they desired to use the hospital, and the War Department also, on June 21, 1944, referred the question of the abandonment of the Breakers to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. This was 2 months after the Army board of officers had determined that the hospital should be abandoned, and also 2 months after the Commanding General, Army Service Forces, had written this committee to the effect that the hospital would be returned to its civilian owners. It appears affirmatively that the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration are referring their hospital acquisition questions to the Federal Board of Hospitalization. The War Department states that it is now doing so. However, the record in the case of the Breakers Hotel indicates a failure on the part of the War Department to consult the Federal Board of Hospitalization until after it had acted.

Certainly, in the case of the Breakers, there was absolutely no coordination of action among the various Federal services either at the time when the hospital was acquired, at which time inquiries to the other forces might have resulted in the Army's realizing that the hotel eventually might prove to be a white elephant, or at the time when the decision was made to abandon the hospital.

It should be pointed out that the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration have refused to use the Breakers Hotel because they have other arrangements which cover their needs, and also because of the Army's representations to them of the high cost involved in utilizing the Breakers Hotel. Both the Navy Department and the Veterans' Administration, facing the prospect of taking the Breakers Hotel at this time as an original proposition, apparently are correct in refusing to consider it. The War Department's position, however, is that of minimizing a loss. In this respect it is entirely different.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has ably stated the conclusions of the committee as set forth in the report which it filed on the subject of the Breakers Hotel. Those conclusions are based on concrete evidence collected and, on a record which, in my opinion, cannot be denied. The record, of course, is open to every Member of the Senate for his inspection, but I think that at the present time it is

appropriate for me to say a few words upon the subject.

Although it may seem to some to be a minor problem, I believe it is a part of a larger one. Many committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives are spending time on the problem of the disposal of surplus property. The report to which I have referred is but an indication of how the Government can acquire a great surplus of property, the disposal of which will confront the Senate and the people of this country. While we have been talking about what has been done during the past, the same thing is being done over and over. In fact, at this very moment the War Department is acquiring the Lake Placid Hotel as well as hotels in Nashville, Tenn., and in Hot Springs, Ark. Only a few days ago we heard from the R. F. C. that they are constructing buildings and acquiring other properties for the services.

So I take it that while this particular question may be considered an important one so far as the War Department is concerned, yet to the people of the country it is but one example of how we are acquiring a great surplus of property, and creating a great problem in its proper disposal so that it will not interfere with the economic stability of the country after the war.

There are further facts, therefore, which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate and of the people of the country. It is with regret that I say that the committee has found that statements of fact made by representatives of the War Department in connection with this entire matter do not appear to be accurate. For instance, the cost per bed as stated by the Engineer Corps to the Surgeon General on the basis of which the Surgeon General agreed to relinquish and turn back to the private owners the hotel, was far in excess of later War Department estimates.

Another instance was the Engineer Corps' bed estimate of a fair rental for the property. It shows that there was not exercised the care and attention which should have been exercised in such matters, and in the acquisition of all property by the Government.

Another instance is in a statement made to the committee. In a letter dated August 16, 1944, the War Department advised our committee that unless the work of reconverting the Breakers to a hotel were begun by August 21, the alterations could not be finished on December 10, when the War Department intends to return the hotel to its owners. This statement was made—and this is not my personal opinion, but the opinion of the committee—in order to induce the committee to complete its investigation. But on April 26, 1944, the War Department advised the committee that the Breakers could be used as a hospital until September 1 of this year, and that there would still be ample time for reconversion for use by the owners during the coming winter season in Florida.

The board of officers appointed by the War Department to consider the abandonment of the Breakers Hotel concluded, on the basis of positive testimony

before them, that the reconversion could be completed within 2 months, including the reinstallation of the hotel furnishings.

The report of the board of officers on the abandonment of the Breakers Hotel contains many self-contradictory statements.

I should like to illustrate the extravagance of the original acquisition of the Breakers Hotel. On December 7, 1942, the management of the hotel was given 5 days' notice that the hotel would be taken. That was after the hotel authorities had engaged the necessary help to go to Florida and had even leased a part of the hotel for the coming season. After only 5 days' notice, the Army demanded possession of the hotel and, as a matter of fact, went to court and obtained an order requiring the hotel management to deliver possession of the hotel to the Army. Actually, the premises were not used as a hospital of any kind until March 1, 1943, when they were opened as a station hospital with a capacity of 1,038 beds. According to the Army's own statement, in March there was a daily average of 32 occupied beds, in April an average of 29, in May an average of 127, in June an average of 221, and in July an average of 200. During that period another private hospital, an eleemosynary institution, could have been acquired for the same purpose for which it was proposed to use the Breakers Hotel.

The Army Air Forces offered the Breakers Hotel to the Surgeon General for use as a general hospital on July 19, 1943, when it became apparent that reduction of Army Air Forces personnel in Florida and failure of overseas evacuations to develop made it unnecessary to retain this facility as a station hospital.

It is now agreed that, as of July 19, an obligation had undoubtedly been incurred to pay a full year's rent of \$40,000.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Am I correct in understanding that when the Breakers Hotel was first taken over no agreement was entered into as to the amount of rental to be paid?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator from Ohio has asked that question. His understanding is exactly correct. At that time an Army major went to New York, interviewed representatives of the East Coast Hotel Co., and stated that the Army was going to take the hotel and that it would pay approximately \$200,000 a year in rental.

Mr. BURTON. Am I to understand that, in now turning the hotel back to its owners, instead of settling for \$200,000 a year the Army is settling for twice that amount, namely, \$400,000?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. So not only was there no agreement when the Army took possession, but it is now paying twice the original estimate which it made when the Army took possession of the hotel.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly correct. It shows how the negotiations were conducted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was a renegotiation clause put into the contract? A contract of that nature should be renegotiated. There is a renegotiation law. I do not know whether the law applies to such contracts as the one involved here, but certainly there ought to be renegotiation of an arrangement of the kind to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I understand that the criticism of the Senator from Michigan is not directed at the settlement agreed upon, but at the estimate which was made by the Army in the first instance. Am I correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator say that the hotel was rented for approximately \$200,000 a year?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; that figure represented the Army's estimate.

Mr. HATCH. The owners of the hotel contended for more than \$500,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they so contended at the time they were told that the property would have to be taken from them.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. At the time the Army took possession of the property no agreement was entered into as to the amount of rental to be paid. The owners of the hotel were contending for approximately \$400,000 or \$500,000 a year. The Army apparently estimated that the rental should be \$200,000 a year. The inadequacy of the Army's estimate is now apparent, because in its readiness to return the hotel to its owners after 2 years of occupancy, it is willing to pay twice the amount of the original estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is what is being said true of many hotels, or is the Senator from Michigan referring to an isolated case?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should say that many other hotels were handled in a similar way. In Seattle the new Richmond Hotel was acquired by the Army for hospital purposes. Later the Navy was asked if it could use the hotel as a hospital, because the Army had decided it did not need it. Representatives of the Navy testified before the investigating committee that they could not under any circumstances use the hotel for hospital purposes, and it was turned back to its owners at considerable cost to the Government.

Mr. President, I am speaking today about the lack of care in the acquisition of properties. The result has been a surplus not only of hospitals but also of lands. We had before the committee statements as to the enormous acreage of farm lands and the enormous acreage

of timberlands and various other kinds of lands that have been acquired. It really shocks the imagination to know the amount of land and the amount of property that have been acquired by the Federal Government by condemnation proceedings during the last few years.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In taking this land they did not agree on any price, did they?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at all. They merely decided overnight, as it were, that they wanted the property in 5 days. They took possession of this large hotel without any other warning and said they would pay \$200,000 a year rental, whereas the owner considered on his own figures that it was worth in excess of \$500,000, and now the Army itself admits that it was worth \$400,000 a year.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. It is my understanding that in Minnesota—the distinguished Senator from that State can tell us about it—they went in and took farm land and they have not paid for it yet. Is not that correct?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in Minnesota they took some of the finest farm land with the best soil and having on it some of the finest farm buildings. They took a great deal of it, and put the owners out, when they could have obtained land that was not so expensively built up and that was not so valuable. Some of that land was worth \$150 an acre and some of it \$200 an acre. I am not sure whether it is a fact, but I was told that it was said by the sales agents of the Army that they were going to pay \$50 an acre for it. I may be wrong about that, but they took the land off the tax rolls in a very prosperous community. To a large extent it will wreck the community. They took the best farm lands having the best farm buildings for which they had no use, when they could have gone somewhere else and taken land on which there were no buildings on which to construct ammunition plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have the comment of the Senator from Minnesota. I think I should indicate that it was the various services and agencies of the Government that were demanding the land. We cannot condemn the Land Division of the Department of Justice, for the manner in which they took it, because the Army and various other services were demanding that it be taken overnight.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to hear the statement of the Senator from Michigan concerning the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice had nothing to do with the original acquisitions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. The Department of Justice is called in when there is a failure

to agree upon a price. Then the Department must institute condemnation proceedings. Is not that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly correct. What I have said is not a criticism of the method of taking land; it is a criticism of the actual taking of the land. The acts of the Land Division of the Department of Justice are not being criticized.

We find that \$299,000 had been invested to convert the premises to a hospital. Substantially the same amount, or \$310,000, would have to be invested to convert it back to a hotel. The total is \$609,000. And after only 4½ months of partial use the Army Air Forces, which had originally taken the hotel, were through with it. As of this point, the total number of patients was 661 and the average number of beds occupied was 122, or a cost for providing the building alone, of over \$8,000 for each bed occupied.

We had in existence at this very time, Mr. President, a hospital board, which was formed back in 1924. If it had been consulted it could have advised as to the necessity or advisability of taking this hotel as a hospital; but it was not consulted and was not asked for its advice.

The War Department's principal reason for abandoning this hotel today appears to be the question of cost. The committee agrees that the original cost was too high. It is clear that the hotel never should have been acquired and that the acquisition was a blunder. But its retention after large financial obligations had been incurred is another question. Our figures show that the total cost of acquiring title to the Breakers for the Government would be \$4,564,000. Our figures also show that whether or not the hotel is bought, it will cost the Government \$1,410,000 to abandon the hotel now, and that, too, after the Government has had very little use of the hotel as a hospital. If we pay the \$4,500,000 to keep the hotel, we do not have to pay the \$1,400,000 in addition. Therefore, it will cost us a net of only \$3,100,000 to keep this hotel. Even the War Department agrees that the hotel can readily be sold after the war with a probable loss to the Government only of normal depreciation. As a result, the net cost for acquiring this hotel, even if we kept it only 3 more years and then sold it, would be only \$700,000. The cost per year for each of 3 years would be only \$234,600. The cost per bed, including all maintenance and repairs, would be \$352 a year, or less than \$1 a day.

The Members of the Senate should know that the War Department is now leasing other hotels. It is leasing them for reassignment purposes. It is acquiring hotels at such places as Lake Placid, N. Y., Asheville, N. C., Hot Springs, Ark., and on the west coast. These hotels will cost between \$1.23 to \$1.72 per bed, per day, whereas, as I have said, the figures show that the Breakers Hotel used for the same purpose would cost only a dollar a day per bed.

The cost of acquiring the Breakers Hotel and using it as a hospital would be considerably less than the cost of a

great many of the other general hospitals, which are not being abandoned, providing there was not charged against the hospital the \$1,410,000 which will have to be paid whether we take it or not. This is a fair assumption. It comes down to this: If it will cost the Government a million and a half dollars, whether or not we have the hotel and for \$3,000,000 more we can get the hotel, obviously the hotel is costing us only \$3,000,000.

The Surgeon General was consulted. He considered the Breakers an excellent hotel, for in a letter dated November 18, 1943, Maj. Gen. W. D. Styre, of the Army Service Forces, stated:

The Surgeon General considers the Breakers one of his best general hospitals and has planned to occupy this facility for the duration of the war and for such a period thereafter as may be necessary to take care of the sick and wounded.

In a memorandum dated July 19, 1943, Brig. Gen. N. W. Grant Air Surgeon, stated:

(a) That the hospital be designated to care for cases requiring specialized treatment in plastic surgery, maxillofacial surgery, ophthalmological surgery, and neurosurgery. (It is believed that a large percentage of cases requiring plastic surgery are air force personnel.)

He goes on to say:

I visualize this hospital as a model institution, bringing together the thoughts of both offices on medical care, and ironing out many apparent differences that have existed for many years.

Yet, in the face of such testimony, we find the Army turning this hotel back and suffering a loss of \$1,410,000. In a memorandum dated July 30, 1943, Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General, stated to the commanding general of the Army Service Forces:

1. It is recommended that the station hospital (1,038 beds) now operated by the United States Army Air Forces in the Breakers Hotel at Palm Beach, Fla., be taken over and operated as an Army general hospital to serve the Florida area and to receive patients through the overseas flyway.

Minimal structural changes have been made, and having been made, this hotel has become a hospital most compact and simple to administer. It would be hard to find a building not originally built as a hospital that so admirably lends itself to hospital purposes. In fact, its physical construction is such that it is better for hospital use than many hospitals and far superior in design and simplicity to our planned cantonment and general hospitals. Equipment and supplies complete as is and in addition a complete 1,000-bed unit in storage which has been very little used.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but does he propose to discuss what it will cost to disband those who now staff this hospital, to disperse the doctors to various other places?

Mr. FERGUSON. I had not proposed to do that, but I will say to the Senator that it represents a considerable amount.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator might very well comment on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say that we have set up a staff of nurses, of internes, and of doctors. We have the hospital, and, as the Surgeon General said, it is completely equipped. We are going to find the patients taken out of this hospital and many of them sent to Atterbury Hospital in Indiana. The doctors will have to find other hospitals in which to work. That is another cause of great expense which we have found in searching the records and in the testimony which was given before us.

It is the unanimous opinion of many doctors residing at Palm Beach, of relatives of servicemen, and of patients at the hospital, and of others who have seen the Breakers Hotel, that it is an excellent facility, particularly for the treatment of plastic surgery cases and for neurosurgery. Its surroundings are ideal from the point of view of morale. There it sits upon the ocean front, giving an ocean view and ocean use to those who are coming back to health, who have been in the armed services.

While the committee did not desire at any time to review decisions which relate particularly to the questions of the most desirable location for operations, such as hospitals and redistribution centers, the committee was of the opinion that in the absence of compelling reasons against the use of the Breakers, this hotel should not be returned to civilian use at this time. It is extraordinary that at the same time that the War Department particularly bemoans what it alleges to be a slackening of morale on the home front, it is willing to return to luxury use one of the most ideally located hospitals available to injured soldiers. Even though only a few of the many soldiers could enjoy these premises, it boosts the morale of every soldier to know that such premises are available to him and his comrades in case they might need it. While no soldier would have thought much of the matter one way or the other if the Breakers had never been taken, many will find it hard to understand why it should be returned and the owners should be paid \$1,410,000 for the meager use that it has been put to in the past 2 years.

In this connection, a very vital aspect of the proposed agreement to return the hotel is that the War Department is to rehabilitate the premises itself. The owners explained to the committee that this is necessary because the owners cannot obtain the necessary materials, whereas the War Department can obtain them from its military supplies not available to civilians generally. This results in giving a priority for such things as linens, paints, and other materials; yes, even telephones and electric wire, to a civilian operation of the most luxurious sort.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the committee have any evidence as to what the Government could sell this hotel for if the Government placed it on the market? What is the fair cash market value now? If it cost \$4,500,000, and we are to pay out more money to rehabilitate it, before we

do so would it not be better to ascertain from some proper source what the hotel could be sold for? We have to look at the question from the Government's standpoint.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may answer that question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I will answer that question, because I have exactly the same idea the Senator from Tennessee has, and, being a little practical minded myself, I thought it was an important consideration. Our committee was informed that this is one of the most salable properties in the United States. Am I not correct in that statement, I ask the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. That statement is exactly correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Government could sell the property at this time and come out whole, manifestly that is what we ought to do with it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HATCH. My own thought is this, that we could take this property and utilize it for hospital purposes. I do not know how long we should use it for such purposes. But when the time came that it was no longer needed for such purposes, I think we could sell the property for pretty close to what it cost, if perhaps not at a profit.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to have that comment, because the figures given before the committee indicated as much. As I stated before, if we take it and use it for a period of 3 years, it would cost about a dollar a day per bed on a resale basis, so we could resell it at that time, after we had used it, instead of acquiring other places which we are acquiring, which are going to cost more per bed.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the hotel cost \$4,500,000, and it is being rented to the Government at \$400,000 a year, that is a very, very large income on the amount invested, and I think the contract should be renegotiated.

Mr. FERGUSON. The payment of \$400,000 rental on a \$4,000,000 property is a high rental.

Mr. President, we find that in addition to the hotel being completely a luxury facility operated only 4 months a year, there are many civilian requirements for the same materials to be used in reconversion, which in addition to being nonluxury needs, can be utilized every day of the year.

In other words, if we keep this property as a hospital, and have the doctors who are there remain, the equipment which is now there would be used, and we would not be required to reconvert it to a luxury hotel, at a time when many of the articles which would be put in there could be put to other civilian use where they would be used 365 days a year, whereas in this hotel they will be used but 4 months in a year.

Mr. President, there is another question I should like to refer to at this time, dealing with the same subject. I wish to comment upon the reluctance of the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, to furnish the committee with

material and factual information to which it was entitled as a matter of law, and which should have been readily and willingly furnished upon request. The report of March 14, 1944, by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Lands Division to General Somervell in regard to the probable liabilities of the Government in settling the condemnation case for acquisition of a leasehold or temporary interest in the Breakers Hotel, contrasted with the possible liabilities of the Government should the hotel be acquired outright, was a factual analysis devoid of any questions involving military secrecy; it involved simply a matter of transacting Government business in a matter which had already been the subject of investigation by our committee. In pressing the committee's investigation further, it was very natural, indeed quite necessary, that the committee should request from the Attorney General a copy of this report.

A request was made to the Attorney General for the report, but the report was not forthcoming. The Attorney General's failure to submit the report retarded the investigation by the committee. Only by subpoena did the committee secure it.

The incident is of great significance as a matter of principle. Not only ordinary courtesy, cooperative relations between the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and the interests of the public welfare, but also the law of the Constitution, demands that fullest cooperation from the Attorney General, as well as other executive officers. The investigational powers of Congress are too well known to require comment. They are as old as the Constitutional Convention and were taken for granted without question there. Indeed, one of the reasons assigned for requiring annual meetings of the Congress was stated by George Mason, Delegate from Virginia, who said that—

The legislature, besides legislative, is to have inquisitorial powers, which cannot safely be long kept in a state of suspension.

In other words, Mr. President, if committees of the Senate are to investigate problems and pass legislation dealing with them, and investigate contracts made with the Federal Government, it is essential that they have the fullest cooperation not only of the Attorney General, but of every other governmental department.

The Attorney General of the United States seems unaware of this vital function of Congress, for on two occasions it has been necessary for this committee to issue a subpoena to secure information from the Attorney General which there was no possible grounds for his refusing to furnish. It seems unfortunate that it should be necessary to advise the chief legal officer of the United States Government in respect to his duties.

The attitude of the Attorney General in this case has been prejudicial to the public interest. It seems that in addition to his opposition to aiding this committee, he declined to make available to the War Department the advice of Assistant Attorney General Littell, who had made an exhaustive study of the Break-

ers Hotel case. General Somervell, having appointed a committee within the War Department to consider the question of policy as to whether the hotel should be acquired outright or relinquished to the owners at the expiration of the lease term, wrote to the Attorney General suggesting that the Department send a representative to meet with that committee, expressly mentioning Assistant Attorney General Littell, but the Attorney General declined to have Mr. Littell participate in those deliberations.

It might well be that his discussion of the case, which this committee has found most helpful in understanding it, would have changed the conclusion reached by General Somervell's committee, as there was otherwise no member of the committee of wholly independent judgment who was not on General Somervell's staff or subject to his authority. In dealing with any public issue of this character, all information in any department and the best expert opinions which are available ought to be brought to bear in the public interest. It is regrettable that the Attorney General did not follow this course in the instant case.

Mr. President, once before I had occasion to mention this identical subject, when we had under consideration the Canol project. In that case we found that the Petroleum Administrator for War was not consulted. If the time has come in America when our agencies are to consult only the "yes" men, and not those who may have knowledge of the facts, and who might be critical of proposals, then I say that this Nation will have surplus goods which it will never be able to dispose of. We shall never be able to enact legislation to dispose of surplus property acquired in the manner in which this property has been acquired. I say that the time has come when "yes" men should not be consulted, but critics of various proposals should be consulted, and we should have civilian judgment as well as military judgment in connection with these problems. We should have a judgment which will satisfy the people of the United States, and which they can support.

SHORTAGE OF FARM MACHINERY IN NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate the desperate plight of the farmers in the Northwest with relation to farm machinery. When this war started, I decided that I would not be a Republican or a Democrat, but an American, fighting for this Republic until the war was over, and that I would put out of my mind all sense of partisanship. But, Mr. President, the Gallup poll tells the story only too well. Farmers all over the country are resenting the rotten, indefensible deal they are receiving at the hands of the present Democratic administration. All over the Northwest farmers are daily losing money because of the incompetency of various bureaucrats holding responsible positions under this administration in Washington.

Last May I called the attention of the Senate and of the heads of various bureaus to what was happening to the farmers because of their inability to obtain farm machinery. I hold in my

hand a letter written on the 12th of June by the administrative assistant of the State committee of the Agricultural Conservation Office at Fargo, N. Dak. It reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Reference is made to your letter of June 5, regarding the application filed by Mr. George A. Schick, of Lark, N. Dak., for a new combine.

I may add for the benefit of Senators who do not know what a combine is that it is a machine used to harvest grain.

This applicant wrote to us on May 15 requesting that the rationing committee act on his combine application. A copy of our reply to that letter is enclosed. Mr. Schick again wrote us on June 1 and his letter of that date is worded practically the same as the letter addressed to you, which we are herewith returning. A copy of our reply to Mr. Schick's letter of June 1 is also enclosed.

We regret that it is necessary for our county committees to disapprove so many applications for new combines, but unless more combines are produced and allotted to North Dakota there is no alternative. As you probably know, our State quota for combines was recently reduced by 763 machines (560 John Deere and 203 McCormick-Deering) because the manufacturers were unable to produce them due to manpower shortages in these plants. We did receive a partial replacement of some of this cut (126 J. I. Case combines) but our allotment is 637 less than the number we had expected to receive. Our present State quota is 2,130 combines of all makes and sizes and a total of approximately 5,500 applications for new combines had been filed in county offices as of May 31, 1944.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND E. MOREHEAD,

Administrative Assistant, State Committee.

Mr. President, this does not begin to tell the story, because county committee after county committee, when farmers applied for combines, were simply told that the quota was exhausted, and that there was no use in filing applications, with the result that thousands of farmers are not included in the list of 5,500.

Mr. President, where are these combines going, which our own farmers in this country cannot get? On the 1st of July, through one little town in North Dakota, the town of Portal—I doubt whether Senators ever heard of it—3 combines were sent to Canada. On July 2, 12 combines were sent to Canada through the town of Portal; on July 3, 20 combines were sent to Canada through the little town of Portal; on July 4, 16 combines; on July 5, 5 combines; on July 6, 5 more; on July 7, 14 combines; on July 8, 8 combines; on July 9, 16 combines; on July 10, 3; on July 11, 3; on July 12, 2; on July 13, 3; on July 14, 3; on July 15, 13; on July 16, 1; on July 17, 11; on July 18, 2; on July 19, 2; on July 22, 4; on July 23, 12; on July 24, 6; on July 26, 14; on July 27, 3; on July 28, 11; on July 30, 13; on July 31, 25. Two hundred and thirty combines were sent to Canada at the very time when our farmers were begging for them. They were sent through the State of North Dakota, past the homes of farmers who were pleading for them.

On the 1st of August 10 combines more went through Portal; on August 2, 12; on August 3, 14; on August 4, 12; on August 7, 33; on August 8, 6; on August 9,

6; on August 13, 2; on August 14, 6; on August 15, 2; on August 16, 3; and up to the 16th, 106 more combines, which are so essential to the welfare of the farmers of North Dakota, were sent through one little town to Canada.

This morning I received a telegram from Portal, reading as follows:

One carload of six combines exported at Portal today.

Mr. President, I have before me many letters, out of thousands which I have in my office. Last Friday I placed 30 or 40 of them in the RECORD. These letters are along the same lines as the ones which I placed in the RECORD the other day. Here is one sent to me by an outstanding citizen of the State of North Dakota, Mr. A. Robbie, a man who has been mayor of his town, the town of Cavalier, in Pembina County.

His letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I hope you will pardon me—

Mr. President, these farmers have been so beaten down by bureaucrats when they were begging for tires, for plows, and for little gears they needed to place in the back of their tractors that now they even apologize to their own Senator for daring to write to him.

This man has been mayor of the town. He writes as follows:

I hope you will pardon me for sending you the wire this morning in regard to the trouble we are having in getting repairs for our machinery. I have just been kept busy chasing over the country trying to locate repairs which the local agents have been unable to supply. One of our combines, a No. 11 International, broke down yesterday and has been idle now for 24 hours just because I could not get concaves. It happened that we picked up metal yesterday and three of them were broken. I finally located one at Hallock, Minn., and just returned from there with it now. It is exasperating to have the machines idle when we have as much grain lying swathed and weather conditions so bad as they have been for the last 3 weeks now. Some of our grain was cut the last week in July and is still on the ground. Anything you can do to help out the present situation will surely be appreciated.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

A. ROBBIE.

On Friday I read a letter, to which I wish to refer now, from Mr. L. Krucken-berg, who lives at the other end of the State. In his letter he says:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I want to inform you that I finally got an order for a new grain binder. Am sorry to report that by the time I will get the machine I may be through with harvesting.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Myhra Equipment Co., in Cass County, showing the number of applications filed by honest-to-God farmers trying to get hold of machinery with which to gather their crops. The letter refers to combines alone. The letter was addressed to Mr. Irvin Piper, who sent it to me. His address is Wheatland, N. Dak.

The letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. PIPER: As per our conversation the other day, we are enclosing a list of farmers' orders we have on hand for Case combines for Cass County farmers.

The orders are only for Case combines, mind you, Mr. President, for Cass County farmers—farmers in just one county, and orders for just one kind of combine.

I read further from the letter:

Our allotment for Case combines for Cass County consists of 10—two 6-foot and eight above 6-foot. We have at the present time received from the Case Co., two 6-foot machines and four 12-foot machines for Cass County on which certificates had been issued for quite some time. By comparing the orders we have on hand with the machines we are allotted it will give you some idea of the seriousness of this situation. In addition to the Case allotment for Cass County we are allotted 3 Gleaner Baldwin 12-foot machines for Cass County. This would make a total of 13. We were allotted 5 more combines from the Case Co. which they do not expect to have manufactured and delivered in time for harvest. The writer hopes that you can make some use of this information.

Mr. President, attached to the letter is a list of those farmers. They live in the vicinity of Fargo, N. Dak.

The list reads as follows:

RETAIL ORDERS FOR CASE COMBINES FOR CASS COUNTY

Selmer Otis, Kindred, 9 feet; Alfred Johnson, Hunter; O. E. Rose, Ayr, 12 feet; John L. Ford, Casselton; Harry Combs, Chaffee; Henry Krabbenhoff, Fargo; I. B. Scoville, Grandin, 12 feet; C. R. Landbloom, Fargo; M. A. Severson, Kindred; H. L. Ecklund, Harwood; A. M. Hedlund, Fargo; Ted. M. Lee, Kindred; Melvin Strand, Hickson; Olof A. Perhus, Kindred; Leo E. Grieger, Erie; Herman Rust, Fargo; B. J. Rogne, Kindred; W. A. Francis, West Fargo; George A. Kounovsky, Fargo; Walter Jahnke, Amenia; Nipstad Brothers, Kindred; Tollef Tronsgaard, Argusville; August Murray, Wheatland; Dale Hull, Page; Earl Franke, Erie; Fred Peach, Erie; Frank Matzke, Buffalo; S. Husso, Erie; Willbert Still, Page; Olander Johnson, Kindred; Iver Bakken, Galsburg; John Brainerd, Portland; Donald Larson, Hunter; William A. Schwandt, Buffalo; E. A. Marcks, Buffalo; T. O. Grant, Fargo; Rudolph Opp, Gardner; Alvin Anderson, Harwood; Richard Weisbach, Durbin; Ed. Boutz, Casselton; Theo. L. Gulvig, Davenport; John Hardin, Fargo; C. O. Peterson, Harwood; Eddie Saewert, Davenport; A. E. Miller, Buffalo; Reuben Kemmer, Casselton; Wallace Spooner, Durbin; Russell Quisberg, Embden; Arnold Hoffman, Wheatland; Allen Gross, Casselton; Richard Viestenz, Arthur; H. E. Combs, Chaffee; W. E. Bucholz, Durbin; Emil Sommerfield, Alice; Emil Hendrickson, Davenport; Virgil Miller, Buffalo; Nathan Idso, Ayr; George Hajek, Davenport; George Schonberg, Casselton; Art Miller, Durbin; Roy D. Cameron, Erie; John Conrad, Erie; Orin Hogen, Buffalo; Clarence Hayek, Fargo; L. Holm, Page; E. A. Goltz, Leonard; W. A. Rueckert, Ayr; J. C. Wadson, Alice; R. E. Cameron, Ayr; Lloyd Miller, Buffalo; Kenneth Erickson, Kindred; Ewald Moderow, Casselton; J. M. Elliott, Grandin; Ed. Wegner, Arthur; A. H. Butke, Buffalo; Otto Schneekloth, Buffalo; Fred Heindinrich, Kindred; Reynold Dittmer, Durbin; Brandsted Brothers, Amenia; Albert Akason, Mapleton; Frank Jendro, Wheatland; Adolph Lebus, Davenport; Lewis Velsting, Arthur; C. T. Perkhous, Arthur; Axel Akeison, Grandin; A. Slingsay, Argusville; J. M. Elliott, Grandin; Joseph Lerfald, Galsburg; Andrew Jespersen, Buffalo; Art Glasow, Davenport; Loraine Langer, Fingal; Myron Stenseth, Buffalo; Edward Kummer, Walcott; Emil Piper, Davenport; William Geerdes, Davenport; Kensok Brothers, Chaffee; E. W. Marshall, Wheatland; W. E. Bayley, Page; William Zimmerman, Arthur; John Bryan, Leonard; Myron Stenseth, Buffalo; R. T. Card, Alice; Ralph Schneekloth, Tower City; Orville Satrom,

Page; Henry Kuball, Grandin; Alfred Johnson, Hunter; Arnold & Hugo Hoffman, Wheatland; F. O. Kellerman, Davenport; Fred Kingston, Casselton; all in the State of North Dakota.

I have read the addresses in order to show the towns in which the farmers live. All of them are within a radius of approximately 25 miles on one side of Fargo, in just one direction. There are a total of 108 applications. Mr. President, I call the attention of this body to the fact that right by the homes of these 108 farmers who are trying to eke out a living, trying to raise grain so that there may be food with which to carry on this war—men who believe that food is just as important as gunpowder and other munitions—the railroads have been transporting combines to Canada.

I have before me some additional letters and telegrams. For example, I hold in my hand a letter from Napoleon, N. Dak., in the southern part of the State. It is typical of the kind of letters which are being sent. The letter is undated, except for the month—August—but I received it only today, so I know it is a recent one. It reads as follows:

MR. LANGER: Today I filled out an application to obtain a certificate to purchase a new truck.

Some Senators may not know what a combine is, but I assume that all Senators know what a truck is. I will show the Senate the experience our farmers are having in their attempts to obtain the trucks they need.

I read further from the letter:

As they have to be appraised in Washington, I thought there might be something you could do to help along for its approval. I know it is asking a great deal of you, but I have always had a great deal of confidence in your work, and trust you will be of great help—

He is applying to a United States Senator, in these times, Mr. President, for assistance in obtaining a little, measly truck so that he can produce food. Is it any wonder that the Gallup poll shows that all over the country the present administration is losing the regard of the farmers—as it should, with this kind of an administration that is treating the farmers in this totally unworthy and abominable manner.

The writer of the letter further says:

You see, I have 800 acres from which the grain has to be hauled, and have a fairly large herd of cattle and hogs, and have no truck at all. I have to depend on the other fellow, and wait until he gets around. Generally it's late, and then he charges so much that he gets more for hauling than I do for raising it. It's unbearable.

Last year my grain was dumped on a pile in the field. The trucker didn't get to haul it until we had a few snowstorms, so you can just about know how much was left for profit.

Mr. President, I might say that I submitted Resolution 185 at a time when we showed there were millions of bushels of grain scattered all over the western section of North Dakota and the eastern section of Montana.

I read further from the letter:

Mother and I are farming together and have 800 acres of crop to haul, and have 60 head of cattle, also other livestock. So

when the year's trucking is totaled, it nearly pays for a truck.

So you can see we have use for a truck the year round. It's just as necessary as a tractor on a farm.

I have on my desk scores and scores of letters and telegrams, some of which I placed in the Record on Friday. They show that the situation relative to tractors is the same as that relative to combines.

The fact is that a number of tractors are being sent to Canada at the very time when thousands of our farmers cannot obtain the tractors they need. That is shown by letters which I shall read, and by the records in the office in Washington.

On July 1, through one little town, namely, Portal, 6 tractors were sent to Canada. On July 2, 20 tractors; on July 3, 35 tractors; on July 4, 22 tractors; on July 5, 17 tractors; on July 6, 5 tractors; on July 9, 9 tractors; on July 10, 32 tractors; on July 11, 6 tractors; on July 13, 12 tractors; on July 14, 28 tractors; on July 15, 17 tractors; on July 16, 8 tractors, and on July 17, 40 tractors were sent through at one time. My information is that they all were equipped with nice rubber tires, just as were the combines which had been shipped from the United States. At least the ones which I myself saw by going to Portal were equipped with rubber tires.

On July 18, 9 tractors were sent through Portal; on July 19, 19 tractors; on July 22, 34 tractors; on July 23, 31 tractors; on July 24, 38 tractors; on July 25, 21 tractors; on July 26, 5 tractors; on July 27, 26 tractors; on July 28, 17 tractors; on July 29, 10 tractors; on July 30, 22 tractors; and on July 31, 25 tractors, or a total of 514 tractors sent through one little town of North Dakota and exported to Canada. It is an indication of the thousands and thousands of tractors which must have been sent to Canada through all the small points of export.

On August 1, 1944, 15 tractors were shipped through Portal, N. Dak., to Canada; on August 2, 3 tractors; on August 4, 3 tractors; on August 7, 4 tractors; on August 11, 4 tractors; on August 12, 4 tractors; on August 13, 10 tractors; on August 14, 16 tractors; on August 17, 5 tractors; and on August 18, 5 tractors, or a total of 69 tractors.

During a period of 6 weeks, when farmers throughout the country were down on their knees begging the Administration for help in obtaining tractors and combines so they could save their crops which were shelling and rotting in the fields, and at the very time the letter which I have read stated that North Dakota could not obtain a quota, there were exported to Canada 583 tractors and 336 combines.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter which is typical of others I have received. It is from Ashley, N. Dak., a town located in the southern section of the State. It was written on the 18th of August 1944. I have just received it.

DEAR SENATOR: I have tried about everything else ever since last January to get a permit for a new tractor without any success or even get the local board or the State office much interested in my case. I have

farmed for several years for myself and have this year 322 acres in crop. * * *

I have always tried to farm with horses, with the intention that if I buy a tractor it should be a new one. They want as high as \$1,400 for old tractors, where new ones can be bought for a little over \$1,100.

That is, if they are available.

I feel that our local board is not treating me fair by always denying me a permit for a new tractor, as I had several chances to buy the new tractor if I had had the permit.

As I showed a few minutes ago, the local boards deny the permits, because, they say, the quotas are not only exhausted but there are already on file thousands upon thousands of applications for tractors which cannot be filled.

I shall not mention the name of the writer of the letter or the name of the persons to whom he refers, because I do not want to get anyone into trouble. The letter continues:

Now Mr. ———, who was my close neighbor, but who is now living in Ellendale and comes from there to help on his farm, has a good tractor and he got a permit since I applied for a new tractor, and he bought a new tractor and now wants to sell me his old one for \$1,000. And there is Mr. ———, who is a trucker and farms from the town of Ashley. He bought a new tractor in 1943 and a new one in 1944, and there are more such cases that had good tractors and sold their old one and bought a new one, but I am always denied. It looks to me there must be either politics in this business or else they pay something to get these favors.

I feel that I will not extra cater or pay anything to get a permit for a new tractor, but I must have a tractor to carry on my farming. I wanted a tractor to harvest my crop, but as I could not get one had to do it with the horses, and then Mr. ——— getting a new tractor and then offering to sell me his old one for \$1,000, that makes me feel that I am just downed. * * *

I was in Aberdeen just recently where they had a new tractor that I could have bought, if I had a permit, for a little over \$1,100, and they had an old one for which they wanted \$1,400.

Mr. President, once more I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the terrible plight of the farmers who cannot obtain machinery. As I said a few days ago, when I was home recently we held a hearing with regard to the situation of farmers who were not able to obtain machinery. One county agent testified that last year a million bushels of wheat and thousands upon thousands of bushels of flax had been destroyed because they could not be harvested. Testimony showed that one farmer had to drive more than 800 miles in order to buy a little 75-cent gear for his tractor. Another man had to drive through several towns before he could obtain a similar gear.

So, Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate once more to the desperate situation in which the farmers of North Dakota find themselves today. I wish Members of the Senate to know that in North Dakota thousands of acres are not being properly harvested because of the lack of necessary machinery with which to harvest them. I wish the Senate also to know that at the very time when the farmers of the United States cannot obtain necessary machinery the National Trucking Association, last Friday, sent me—and I presume

every other Member of the Senate—a magazine showing that they have sent trucks all over the world, including Ethiopia. In behalf of the farmers of this country, I wish to protest most vigorously, Mr. President, against the kind of treatment which the farmers are receiving at the hands of this administration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law. By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment for temporary service in the Navy; and Col. Franklin A. Hart, to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from September 25, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Service nominations on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 22 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Theodore P. Wright, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, vice Charles I. Stanton, resigned.

RECORDER OF DEEDS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Marshall L. Shepard, of Pennsylvania, to be recorder of deeds, District of Columbia, vice William J. Thompkins, deceased.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON, EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Sidney Frederick, August 15, 1944.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEONS EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1944

Raymond F. Kaiser
John P. Turner

IN THE NAVY

Ensign Clarence F. Avery, A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to be an ensign in the Navy, to rank from the 6th day of January 1941.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Joseph O. M. Thatcher, October 7, 1941.

Edmond P. Larkin, November 22, 1941.

Bothwell Graham III, May 26, 1942.

Francis E. Martin, July 6, 1942.

Rider R. Lewis, July 14, 1942.

Byron D. Casteel, July 15, 1942.

Charles B. Tolle, July 1, 1943.

Richard B. Leander, July 8, 1943.

Mark F. Todd, July 10, 1943.

Robert P. Lyons, July 10, 1943.

John F. Kincald, Jr., July 10, 1943.

Charles W. Harding, July 10, 1943.

John A. Pease, July 10, 1943.

Robert T. Maurer, July 11, 1943.

Edward J. Hagan, July 12, 1943.

Donald B. Freshwater, July 24, 1943.

John R. Cole, January 9, 1944.

V. Dale Alquist, January 13, 1944.

Arthur B. Watts, January 10, 1944.

Joseph F. Rorke, January 20, 1944.

Jackson H. Stuckey, March 6, 1944.

Kenneth G. Jones, April 4, 1944.

Claude E. Arnett, Jr., May 3, 1944.

William B. Ford, May 30, 1944.

William A. Cantrell, June 1, 1944.

James A. Stewart, June 1, 1944.

Frederick G. Dorsey, June 1, 1944.

Dorliska W. Brown, Jr., June 5, 1944.

Charles C. Sprague, June 6, 1944.

Joe B. Stephens, June 6, 1944.

Marvin F. Sherrill, June 7, 1944.

Walter D. Roberts, June 7, 1944.

Malcolm Y. Colby, Jr., June 7, 1944.

Henry G. Gardiner, Jr., June 7, 1944.

Jackson W. Modisett, June 7, 1944.

John R. Weber, June 7, 1944.

Arvin T. Henderson, June 7, 1944.

Jack J. Hatfield, June 7, 1944.

Victor V. Davie, June 7, 1944.

Rolla D. Burghard, June 8, 1944.

Richard L. Mason, June 8, 1944.

William C. Mills, Jr., June 8, 1944.

Walter P. Anthony, Jr., June 8, 1944.

William R. Thornton, June 9, 1944.

James Y. Bradfield, June 10, 1944.

Andrew J. Causey, June 10, 1944.

William H. Thompson, June 27, 1944.

Donald E. Stephens, June 27, 1944.

Irving L. White, June 27, 1944.

Robert H. Mitchell, June 28, 1944.

Marshall M. Searcy, June 30, 1944.

Hugh H. Hanson, July 8, 1944.

Charles F. Climie, Jr., July 26, 1944.

John T. Manning, July 26, 1944.

John D. Conway, July 28, 1944.

John W. Markson, July 28, 1944.

George H. Lawrence, July 28, 1944.

Eugene W. Rumsey, August 5, 1944.

Amos B. Root, Jr., August 5, 1944.

Frank R. Morrow, August 5, 1944.

Donald B. Hull, August 5, 1944.

Adrian B. Goodman, August 5, 1944.

Walter R. Ogden, August 5, 1944.

Franklin J. Grabill, August 9, 1944.

Ensign William K. Woodward, D-V(G), United States Naval Reserve, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 18th day of February 1943.

Assistant Paymaster James J. Lynch to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 9th day of June 1941, to adjust the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Assistant Paymaster Rex W. Warner to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

Ensign William T. Peach 3d, United States Navy, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the 19th day of June 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended:

Donald G. H. Jaekels, from the 16th day of March 1941.

Kenneth R. Chamberlain, from the 16th day of July 1941.

Robert J. Bear, from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert F. Stout, from the 4th day of August 1941.

Robert W. Vaupell, from the 18th day of August 1941.

Harold G. Schlendering, from the 30th day of August 1941.

James B. Maguire, Jr., from the 8th day of October 1941.

Clair "C" Chamberlain, from the 10th day of October 1941.

John P. Sigman, from the 14th day of October 1941.

George F. Bastian, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Israel E. Boniske, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Brenten G. Myking, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Robert O. White, from the 16th day of October 1941.

Jack E. Conger, from the 16th day of December 1941.

James A. Gilchrist, from the 16th day of December 1941.

Oliver T. Koch, from the 16th day of December 1941.

Elton Mueller, from the 16th day of December 1941.

Lynn H. Stewart, from the 16th day of December 1941.

John "E" Hughes, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Arnold A. Lund, from the 9th day of January 1942.

John B. Maas, Jr., from the 9th day of January 1942.

Henry S. Sabatier, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Louis R. Smunk, from the 9th day of January 1942.

John R. Stack, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Robert W. Teller, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Joe L. Warren, from the 9th day of January 1942.

Joseph W. White, Jr., from the 9th day of January 1942.

Eugene A. Trowbridge, from the 7th day of February 1942.
 Jack L. Brushert, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 William E. Crowe, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Samuel B. Folsom, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Thomas W. Furlow, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 George L. Hollowell, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Samuel Richards, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Leo F. Tatro, Jr., from the 9th day of February 1942.
 Howard L. Walter, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 George D. Wolverton, from the 9th day of February 1942.
 William "B" Freeman, from the 12th day of March 1942.
 Raymond A. Rogers, Jr., from the 12th day of March 1942.
 Wallace G. Wethe, from the 12th day of March 1942.
 Frank P. Barker, Jr., from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Willard C. Lemke, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Carroll E. McCullah, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Edward J. Montagne, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Clarence H. Moore, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Arthur N. Nehf, Jr., from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Martin B. Roush, from the 14th day of March 1942.
 Carol D. Dalton, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 James E. Grubbs, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 Henry W. Horst, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 Robert W. Johannesen, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 William G. Johnson, from the 17th day of March 1942.
 Francis X. Witt, Jr., from the 17th day of March 1942.
 William P. Dukes, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 Jay E. McDonald, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 John D. Noble, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 Billie K. Shaw, from the 25th day of March 1942.
 Joseph F. Wagner, Jr., from the 25th day of March 1942.
 George B. Herlihy, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 Dale M. Leslie, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 William P. Mitchell, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 James L. Secrest, from the 3d day of April 1942.
 Gordon L. Allen, from the 23d day of April 1942.
 Richard L. Braun, from the 23d day of April 1942.
 Werlin U. Gray, from the 23d day of April 1942.
 Clinton C. Basinger, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Edmund W. Berry, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Howard W. Bollmann, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Dan H. Johnson, from the 1st day of May 1942.
 Billy C. Marks, from the 15th day of May 1942.
 Frank B. Baldwin, from the 22d day of May 1942.
 Charles H. Woodley, from the 22d day of May 1942.

Robert H. Brumley, from the 8th day of June 1942.
 Dennis P. Casey, from the 8th day of June 1942.
 William L. Gunness, from the 8th day of June 1942.
 Samuel "C" Roach, Jr., from the 8th day of June 1942.
 John Skinner, Jr., from the 8th day of June 1942.
 Fred J. Gilhuly, from the 18th day of June 1942.
 John E. Worlund, from the 18th day of June 1942.
 Robert E. Kelly, from the 19th day of June 1942.
 Harold L. Spears, from the 19th day of June 1942.
 Augustus L. Arndt, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 Percy F. Avant, Jr., from the 25th day of June 1942.
 William N. Case, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 John E. Hays, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 Archie D. Simpson, from the 25th day of June 1942.
 Clyde H. Davis, Jr., from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Richard E. French, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Lynn "N" Kelso, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Henry M. Turner, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 Ray K. Wolff, from the 13th day of July 1942.
 John F. Eolt, Jr., from the 18th day of July 1942.
 Elmer F. Brooks, Jr., from the 18th day of July 1942.
 John G. Charbeneau, from the 18th day of July 1942.
 Reinhardt Leu, from the 18th day of July 1942.
 Jack M. Wells, from the 18th day of July 1942.
 John L. Morgan, Jr., from the 23d day of July 1942.
 Wilbur J. Thomas, from the 23d day of July 1942.
 Floyd C. Haxton, from the 5th day of August 1942.
 George Major, from the 5th day of August 1942.
 Thomas L. Wyatt, from the 5th day of August 1942.
 Warner O. Chapman, from the 11th day of August 1942.
 Thomas R. Merritt, from the 11th day of August 1942.
 Robert Dalley, Jr., from the 16th day of September 1942.
 Homer L. Daniel, from the 16th day of October 1942.
 "H" Leverett Jacobl, from the 16th day of October 1942.
 Richard K. Todd, from the 16th day of October 1942.
 John D. Curd, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Julius F. Koetsch, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Robert D. Morris, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Paul A. Mullen, from the 1st day of November 1942.
 Wiley A. Green, from the 16th day of November 1942.
 Charles "E" Cornwell, from the 1st day of December 1942.
 Arthur P. Duttonhofer, Jr., from the 1st day of December 1942.
 Walter A. Petersen, from the 1st day of December 1942.
 William W. Blakely, a citizen of California, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943.

Richard R. Breen, a citizen of Louisiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of May 1944:

Fred F. Harbin, a citizen of North Carolina.
 Michael D. Benda, a citizen of West Virginia.

William A. Wilson, a citizen of Kentucky.
 Edwin L. Hickman, Jr., a citizen of Tennessee.

Howard K. Alberts, a citizen of New Jersey.
 John B. Sullivan, a citizen of New Jersey.
 Robert E. Wagoner, a citizen of Wisconsin.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 22 (legislative day of August 15), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Joseph F. Burt to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Oliver Edmund Clubb to be a consul general of the United States of America.

Randolph A. Kidder to be a consul of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who are the great source of life and light, from whom our spirits have come and unto whom they shall return, we pray that while we live and labor for a brief time upon this earth we may be numbered among those who do justly, who love mercy, and who walk humbly with the Lord.

This is a day which Thou has made and we will rejoice and be glad in it. Grant that we may face with courage and hope its many duties and tasks that challenge the consecration of the noblest abilities and capacities with which we have been endowed. Help us to respond with unfaltering faith and fortitude to the call of human need and the upward urge of Thy spirit.

Hasten the day when the forces of righteousness shall be victorious and all selfish and sordid ambitions and all those sinister and debasing feelings of hatred, prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance which are continually storming the citadel of man's soul shall be forever banished from the world and become supplanted by love and good will. Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include

therein a very interesting article which appeared in last Sunday's Boston Globe of August 20, by James Morgan, entitled "Freedom Can Own the Future."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a radio address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief statement by the master of the National Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Daily Washingtonian, of Hoquiam, Wash.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a summary of the G. I. bill of rights.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a short statement from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner entitled "West Coast Manpower."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein some short resolutions adopted at the reunion of the Second Oregon Volunteers of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address prepared for delivery by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Harry W. Bashore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on four different subjects; in one to include an address by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News entitled "Commander in Chief."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 29, 1944, I had occasion to transmit to the Congress a declaration and two resolutions adopted by the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference which was held in Philadelphia April 20–May 12, 1944. I then stated that upon receipt of the authentic text of the recommendations adopted by the conference I would transmit these to the Congress as required by the constitution of the international labor organization. These texts having now been received, I transmit them herewith. The recommendations are as follows:

Recommendation (No. 67) concerning income security.

Recommendation (No. 68) concerning income security and medical care for persons discharged from the armed forces and assimilated services and from war employment.

Recommendation (No. 69) concerning medical care.

Recommendation (No. 70) concerning minimum standards of social policy in dependent territories.

Recommendation (No. 71) concerning employment organization in the transition from war to peace.

Recommendation (No. 72) concerning the employment service.

Recommendation (No. 73) concerning the national planning of public works.

Employers and workers as well as governments were represented at the twenty-sixth session of the International Labor Conference which adopted these recommendations by large majorities.

As these recommendations were developed with a view to promoting the social security and economic advancement of the peoples of the world, our own included, I believe the Congress will find them valuable in its current consideration of problems of demobilization, reconversion of industry, employment, and social security.

At a later time I may have occasion to direct further attention to specific provisions of these recommendations and to suggest what action by the Congress on these recommendations may be advisable.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 22, 1944.

[Enclosure: Authentic copy of the recommendations adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-sixth session.]

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5125, with Mr. THOMAS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. We are now considering section 12 on page 34, and that section is open to amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 34, line 16, strike out the words "disposition of plants", and insert the words "applicability of antitrust laws."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, this is purely a corrective amendment. In the mechanical process of getting this bill printed and placed before the House, the caption "Disposition of plants," which properly precedes section 13 of the bill, was transposed to section 12. My amendment simply attributes to section 12 what seems to be the proper caption. If this amendment is adopted I shall ask unanimous consent that the caption "Disposition of plants" go forward to section 13.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. That amendment is satisfactory to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request to place the caption "Disposition of plants" before section 13, will be granted.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 13. (a) No Government agency shall dispose of any surplus Government-owned plant for the production of synthetic rubber,

or aluminum, which cost the Government \$5,000,000 or more, except in accordance with this section or pursuant to an option therefor.

(b) The Administrator may authorize any disposal agency to lease any such surplus plant for a term of not more than 5 years.

(c) The Administrator shall prepare and submit to Congress a report as to each class of such property—

(1) describing the number, cost, and location of such surplus plants and setting forth other descriptive information relative to the use and potential use thereof;

(2) outlining the economic problems that may be created by the disposition thereof;

(3) setting forth a plan or program for the care and handling, disposition, and use thereof consistent with the policies and objectives of this act; and

(4) describing any steps already taken with respect to the care and handling, disposition, and use of the property, including any contracts relating thereto.

The Administrator shall request Government agencies to submit information and suggestions for use in the preparation of such reports and shall encourage States, political subdivisions thereof, and private persons to submit such information and suggestions, and he shall submit to the Congress, together with each such report, copies or summaries of such information and suggestions. After 6 months from the submission of a report hereunder, unless the Congress provides otherwise by law, the Administrator may authorize the appropriate disposal agencies to dispose of such property in accordance with the plan or program proposed in the report to Congress.

(d) The Administrator may authorize any disposal agency to dispose of any materials or equipment related to any surplus plant covered by subsection (a) of this section, if such materials and equipment are not necessary for the operation of the plant in the manner for which it is designed.

(e) This section shall not apply to any Government-owned equipment, structure, or other property operated as an integral part of a privately owned plant and not capable of economic operation as a separate and independent unit.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on behalf of the committee, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 36, after line 15, insert the following subsection:

"(d) No Government agency shall dispose of any surplus Government-owned plant of any character, which cost the Government \$1,000,000 or more, without the approval of a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Advisory Board created under section 4 (a) of this act, or of a majority of a quorum of such Board (which quorum shall not be less than a majority of the Board) at a meeting duly called for the purpose."

Page 36, line 16, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Page 36, line 18, after "(a)" insert "(or (d))."

Page 36, line 21, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the section under consideration involves the disposition of war plants. The estimated cost of those plants is around \$15,000,000,000. This was one of the most perplexing parts of the bill, and the committee gave much consideration to the disposal of these plants. Some of the plants cost \$50,000,000; some \$100,000,000.

The theory of this bill is that without in any way interfering with our domestic

economy to promote wide distribution, to provide for employment, we should convert, as soon as practicable, our country from a wartime to a peacetime basis. Under section 13, for the reasons assigned in the general debate, no Government-owned plant for the production of synthetic rubber or aluminum which cost \$5,000,000 or more was to be disposed of except as provided in this section. This section provides for reports to Congress and prevents the disposition of these two classes of plants unless the Congress takes action within 6 months.

The amendment I have proposed on behalf of the committee would insert a new subsection, and with the consent of the committee I will read the amendment:

No Government agency shall dispose of any surplus Government-owned plant of any character, which cost the Government \$1,000,000 or more, without the approval of a majority of the members of the Surplus Property Advisory Board created under section 4 (a) of this act, or of a majority of a quorum of such Board, which quorum shall not be less than a majority of the Board, at a meeting duly called for the purpose.

Section 4 of this act establishes a Surplus Property Advisory Board. Its functions were to advise and consult. It was suggested that they ought to have more power. This Board is composed of the Chairman, the Administrator, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Administrator of the War Food Administration, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Administrator of Foreign Economic Administration.

This bill confers upon the Administrator vast powers. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], a member of the committee, was among those members of the committee who desired to safeguard the vast authority conferred upon the Administrator, and the committee shared that view. These plants were established by one Government agency. They were established under the direction of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is necessary to provide for disposal of these plants. This amendment provides that before any plant, after it has been considered by all the advisory committees that may be invoked by the Administrator—including the mandatory committees provided in the so-called Patman amendment—before he can dispose of it, it must be approved by affirmative action of a majority of a quorum of the board representing all of the agencies of the Government, substantially.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As stated, on plants costing \$5,000,000 or more, involving synthetic rubber, as is well known, there will be international questions involved; questions arising in the peace. There has been wide publicity and criticism with respect to aluminum and the Aluminum Trust. It was thought that Congress should be given 6 months in which to decide whether or not they would dispose of these properties as recommended by the Administrator.

We emphasized that there must be power for the disposal of these plants if our economy is to be converted from a war economy to a peacetime economy.

I want to give an illustration that I think ought to be convincing, if not all-conclusive. During the First World War we established Muscle Shoals to provide for the generation of nitrogen.

I remind the Congress, I remind the House, that it was more than 15 long years before that property was ever finally disposed of by the Congress of the United States, and when it was disposed of it resulted in the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority in which our Government has invested several hundreds of millions of dollars. There must be a power of disposal and it was the view of those of us who have suggested this amendment that, inasmuch as the Administrator is to dispose of any assets of these plants, it would be fair for that Administrator not only to have the benefit of the advice of the board of directors of the plant itself but to have the advice and the consent of the various heads of the departments of the Government, including the War Production Board, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy. So this amendment provides that before any plant costing a million dollars or more can be disposed of it must have the affirmative approval of the board. This confers on that board the power not merely to advise but a power that means a great deal.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Texas first.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's statement is confusing at that point.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It safeguards and hedges the disposal of these plants the very best way that the committee was able to devise, because the committee is of the view that if the Congress of the United States which provided in a few words, in a brief act, for the establishment of these plants by the Defense Plants Corporation, undertakes as a Congress to provide for the disposal of each one of these plants costing more than a million dollars there will not only be delay but the very purpose of this bill will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. I wish to ask the gentleman two or three questions to find out how far this goes. It seems to me to be a step in the right direction. Does it include all plants and facilities such as oil

pipe lines, gas pipe lines, oil plants, electronic and chemical plants?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It applies to all war plants of every kind and description.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it an amendment to section 13 (a)?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; it is an amendment to the pending section 13.

Mr. PATMAN. Does it eliminate the subsequent provisions which will require the Administrator to make a report to Congress?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not; and those specific provisions apply only to the two exceptions here which are synthetic rubber and aluminum plants costing \$5,000,000 or more. Those provisions remain in the bill and reports which are required to be submitted to Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Why not make them apply to all plants such as steel, chemical, electronic, radar, all of them?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I undertook to anticipate the gentleman's question, and I stated as best I could that in the view of the committee if we required a report to Congress on all of the plants costing a million dollars or more there would be delay in the disposition of these plants that would really defeat the purpose of undertaking to dispose of surplus war plants. They aggregate \$15,000,000,000; they cover plants of every description, and it was the view of the committee that in plants costing over a million dollars the requirement that to get the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior, just to use two members as a part of this advisory board to consent, that to get the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy to consent was ample; we were unable to devise any better safeguard. The Secretary of the Department of War and the Secretary of the Department of the Navy would know more about these plants than we could probably learn from a report of them. There are a thousand of these plants, as I understand. It was the view of the committee that to provide for a separate consideration by the Congress for the disposal of a thousand plants—now I do not mean to assert that all of those cost over a million dollars—but there are many of these surplus plants—would defeat the very purpose of this bill. If we could entrust to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the investment of this \$15,000,000,000, or to that corporation and the Department of War and the Department of the Navy the construction of these plants where they are established by those two departments, surely we could safeguard the disposal of those plants by having the views not only of those agencies but of a majority of other agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Suppose efforts should be made to dispose of a steel plant that cost more than a million dollars, or \$5,000,000; just exactly how could the Administrator do that? Would he be required to get the approval of a majority of that board if he could do it?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. He would if it cost over \$1,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. A steel plant, a radar plant, a chemical plant, any kind of plant including pipe lines and so forth?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. He would have to have a majority agreement. What was meant by the word "minority" when it was used in the amendment?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not use the word "minority"; that was a mistake, that was a misreading of the clerk. There is no such word as "minority" in the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. There must be the approval of a majority before he can dispose of any plant or facility.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so, sir. I now yield gladly to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that his amendment did amend section 13 (a)?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. No; it does not amend section 13 (a). It would amend section 13 and was inserted as a new section (d). It does not change the language of section 13 (a).

Mr. STEFAN. It does not change the language of (a) of section 13.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does not.

Mr. STEFAN. Then I believe the gentleman defeats exactly what he is trying to arrive at. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk to strike out the figure \$5,000,000 from section 13 (a), eliminate that entirely, but I will be glad to amend it to make it \$1,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I can answer the gentleman's point; I understand that the purpose the gentleman has in mind is to strengthen and reinforce the amendment.

There is no amendment of section 13 (a); so before any synthetic rubber or alcohol plant costing \$5,000,000 or more could be disposed of it would have to be in accordance with section 13 (a). We further provide that no synthetic-rubber plants and no aluminum plants or any other Government plants costing over \$1,000,000 shall be disposed of unless the provisions of this amendment are complied with which would require the affirmative approval of a majority of the board.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; but why not eliminate the \$5,000,000? Leaving that in the bill is playing right into the hands of the big international cartel which wants to destroy our synthetic-rubber industry and aluminum plants. I say we should strike out that \$5,000,000 and equalize it with the \$1,000,000 mentioned in the gentleman's amendment. Otherwise it means the destruction of the plants mentioned in section 13 (a).

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With all deference, the gentleman, if he will pardon me, is mistaken. As I stated, the amendment we offer here does not in any way interfere with the \$5,000,000 aluminum and synthetic-rubber plants.

Mr. STEFAN. Then that means the disposal of any of those plants costing under \$5,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Those plants are protected with the language that is in the bill now; that provision remains in the bill. Then, in addition to the requirement that the \$5,000,000 plants be reviewed by Congress it further provides that before there can be any disposition of them or any plants costing \$1,000,000 or more it must be by the approval of a majority of the board. So that under section 13 (a) before this recommendation that a synthetic plant costing \$5,000,000 or more be sold is submitted by the Administrator to Congress under the language as it now appears in the bill, it would have to have his approval and his recommendation and the approval of a majority of the board.

Mr. STEFAN. All right. Why not change the \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman may do that later on, but it would interfere with my amendment at this time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Am I correct that the gentleman's amendment leaves all language that now appears in section 13 as it is and adds additional language?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It does. It is additional language. This amendment inserts, to answer the gentleman's question, a new subsection, as (d). Then on page 36, it changes subsection (d) to (e) accordingly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In other words, all the language that we now read in section 13 remains in the bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In addition to which under the gentleman's amendment there is this additional requirement which would be of universal applicability as to any kind of a plant that cost more than \$1,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman's amendment applies to property in the hands of the owning agency or in the hands of the Administrator after it has been declared to be surplus.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It only applies to surplus Government-owned property and to no other. If it is a war installation, if it is held by the Army, Navy, or Defense Plants Corporation, it is only after those plants are declared to be surplus.

Mr. FOLGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. There are words "or pursuant to an option." Will the gentleman tell us why that is put in there? That exempts them from the operation of this section, as I understand it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. According to the hearings many of these plants were constructed by corporations that are in that business and those corporations have been operating the plants. There were options in connection with a number of the plants that would enable the operating company to acquire these plants. The gentleman's question is very pertinent. I have in mind only one case thus far, and this should be of general interest to all Members of the House, where an option has been exercised, the only case of importance, by the Bethlehem Steel Co. That plant cost \$30,000,000 in round figures, and they exercised their option to acquire that plant at what it cost the Government. That option was written into the operating contract and it would be binding, and properly so. I may say furthermore that according to the best information the committee has been able to obtain there is not a great deal of property in connection with which many more options will be exercised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SOME PLANTS SHOULD BE PUT IN GREASE FOR YEARS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am impressed that this is a good amendment. Personally, I would rather have a board pass on this question than to have a report to the Congress. Obviously, the Congress cannot do very much in the 6 months' time allowed. It occurs to me that much care and caution should be used in the disposal of these plants. In my opinion, many of them should be put in grease for 5 or 10 years or even longer as insurance against the possibility of another emergency such as we experienced on December 7, 1941. These plants should not be quickly disposed of. They should be very carefully disposed of. There should be no hurry about it.

It occurs to me also that in section 13 (a) this could be enlarged upon to include radar equipment, electronics, steel, chemicals, and other plant facilities, including oil and gas pipe lines; but as long as the board has the power to pass upon this question and the board would certainly give it careful consideration, the public, in my judgment, will be properly protected by the method outlined in the gentleman's amendment. Therefore, I am inclined to give the amendment my wholehearted support in preference to an amendment which I had prepared to amend section 13 (a).

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that the purpose of including the language "any surplus Government-owned plant" was to provide for what the gentleman has stated. We have had applications by chemical plants and by sulfur plants,

and this is all-inclusive. It covers all plants, pipe lines, and other plants.

Mr. PATMAN. It includes every war plant or war facility, including oil lines and gas lines and everything else that cost a million dollars or more?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so. We have the two safeguards here.

Mr. PATMAN. Some of us were confused by the Clerk reading something concerning the power of the minority of that board.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That was a mistake.

Mr. PATMAN. It will require the concurrence of a majority of the members of that board before any plant costing a million dollars or more can be disposed of, and I refer to any war plant or facility?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; and we safeguard it further. In some of our committees we may have less than a majority as a quorum, but we have fixed it that they have to have a majority of that board for the transaction of business.

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad to support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to because it seems to me it is of a wholesome character. I was troubled at first by the fact that in section 13 we had no more drastic supervision over the disposal of plants which represented a very large investment by the Government. I was also one of those who felt that it was regrettable that there was no board under which the Administrator would function. It seemed to me, as the original bill came before the House, that the Surplus Property Advisory Board, as provided for in section 4, was really not a great deal more than window dressing. But with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, the Surplus Property Advisory Board acquires real and important functions which will safeguard in a substantial way the interests of the public. I think the pending amendment goes far to remove some of the most serious objections which many of us felt were in the bill as it originally came before the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think it is fair to say that the gentleman is too modest in the statement he has just made. He was alone at first in stating that we ought, in every way we could, safeguard the disposal of these plants, and I know of no member of the committee who is more responsible for the amendment that is now pending than the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] except that I want to change the "\$5,000,-

000" in section 13 (a) to "\$1,000,000" in order to help the gentleman's amendment. I have such an amendment on the Clerk's desk at this time which would make that change.

I agree that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] improves this bill. It gives some hope to those of you who have petroleum plants, shale plants, and alcohol plants in your districts. Unless you so amend section 13 (a) and change the figure \$5,000,000 to \$1,000,000, I am afraid you are going to play right into the hands of those who may be endeavoring to get us to scrap our synthetic-rubber plants.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say that I agree heartily with what the gentleman is saying, but does not the gentleman agree with me that the Whittington amendment would make the \$1,000,000 figure applicable on synthetic-rubber plants as well as others?

Mr. STEFAN. I do not believe so, unless you change that figure of \$5,000,000. The gentleman in one word says that he has fixed it now so that in reference to a plant costing a million dollars or more they will have to come to Congress before they can scrap it. Then the gentleman says, "Here is a plant costing \$5,000,000 or more," and he specifies synthetic rubber.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am as interested in this subject as the gentleman is, and I want to get it cleared up. As I understand, the bill, if the Whittington amendment is adopted, will say this: It will say that as to synthetic rubber and aluminum plants costing \$5,000,000, the Administrator must make a report to the Congress, and the Congress must approve of what he proposes to do, but that as to all plants—

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman trying to make a speech for me?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I am not. I am trying to get this straightened out.

Mr. STEFAN. I will agree with the gentleman to this extent that perhaps there is some language in there that would indicate that, but why not put it in plain English language so that the people can understand it? Why put a figure of \$1,000,000 in one section and \$5,000,000 in another?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. To finish the statement I started a moment ago, I understand the Whittington amendment to mean that as to all plants which cost \$1,000,000 or more, including synthetic rubber plants and aluminum plants, that nothing shall be done without the approval of the Board. Am I correct?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I so stated repeatedly.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has so stated, but in section 13 (a) it says:

No Government agency shall dispose of any surplus Government-owned plant for the production of synthetic rubber, or aluminum, which cost the Government \$5,000,000 or more.

It is somewhat confusing. Why not change it to \$1,000,000?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last 4 minutes to be available to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, had the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Poulson] to section 4 been adopted, then, of course, this amendment would be a real safeguard, as the gentleman from Mississippi has described it. Had an advisory board been created, such as the gentleman from California had proposed, of course this amendment would have been very desirable. I ask the members of the Committee to read section 4 and then you can readily appreciate that this is more or less window dressing. It does no harm. It does no particular good. What is the difference whether the amount involved is \$5,000,000 or \$5,000? It is just as important that a transaction involving \$5,000 be safeguarded as a transaction involving \$5,000,000.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Is the gentleman thinking now of the particular persons who are holding these offices, and saying that because those particular persons are now holding these various offices, as heads of the various departments of the Government, it does not mean anything, but if these offices are changed, and other persons will then hold them, then it might mean something? Is that what the gentleman is trying to tell us?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, the gentleman answers his own question.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman will admit that if the amendment is adopted the bill will be at least a wee bit better, and that therefore he is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. BENDER. The safeguards that should have been adopted were not adopted earlier in the consideration of this bill. Whatever additional pious language we can insert in this bill, such as is contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, does no harm, but in my opinion does no particular good.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment to ask the committee this question. Take, for instance, a powder plant, where considerably more than a million dollars has been invested in permanent facilities; would it be possible, if it be declared surplus, to lease it in whole or in part to private concerns for the manufacture of civilian goods, subject to recapture by the Government in any emergency?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I answer the gentleman by saying that that is

provided for in section 10 (a) where we say "by sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition, for cash, credit, other property." That was the occasion, if I may say, for the broad language of section 10 (a).

Mr. HOBBS. It seemed to me that that was the purpose, and I agree with the gentleman. It seems to me, however, that there should be some clarification on the floor, since in connection with many plants in the smaller communities it would be very doubtful if there could be raised a sum of money necessary to purchase any one of them.

If it is declared surplus, it simply means that it is not feasible for the agency of the Government that owns it or controls it to use it further for the purpose for which the plant was built, but it could be used, and in many instances it could be used advantageously, for the production of other goods the Nation needs without essentially changing the plant so as to render it worthless for the prime purpose for which it was constructed. In such a case, the plant could be utilized for peaceful purposes and be recaptured for war purposes when war made it necessary.

The one way that you can get any real money out of some of these plants is to have them split up and operated during peace for civilian purposes by private lessees. I know one plant, for instance, that is susceptible of division into four smaller plants, not one of which would change a single major unit. Thus, the rentals would give the Government a substantial return on its investment, while preserving the essential parts of the original plant, so it could profitably be recaptured for war purposes should such need arise. That is the only way the little man can come in for a share of it or do the community in peacetime any good. The gentleman is perfectly clear that that is feasible and proper and normal if the facts warrant it in the judgment of the disposing agency?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the answer I have made is a fair one. If the Government leases this property, at the expiration of the lease it is going to be in the hands of the Government. This particular section here provides for just what the gentleman has in mind, that we cannot use all of it.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman thinks that the over-all declaration of policy, to get the most out of it, to distribute the benefits widely, to prevent monopoly, and to prevent profiteering would govern at least to the extent I have indicated?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would go further and say that in addition to the objectives and in addition to the policies we have made it a provision of the bill.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this section of the bill is one that, to my mind, is the most important section, perhaps, of the whole bill. I myself have prepared three different amendments thereto, one of which would have said that you could not sell one of these Government plants to any corporation that already controlled more than

20 percent of the business in a given field.

I have been trying to do the best I could on this bill. I am convinced that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi helps the bill a good deal. Personally, I want to go further than he does. But it is not true, in my judgment, as the gentleman from Ohio said, that this board that is provided, even the one that is provided in the bill, would be of no importance. I supported the amendment of my colleague from California [Mr. Poulson]. I should much rather have had a citizens board in control of this program, and I still hope it will be done as the result of conference with the Senate. Nonetheless, on this board that has to approve the sales under this amendment are included the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; the Chairman of the War Production Board, who I hope will still be Mr. Donald Nelson, incidentally; the Secretary of the Interior; and the Secretary of Agriculture—a very broad group of Government officials.

The point is that under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi none of this can be disposed of without wide public discussion of the matter, which, after all, is perhaps the most important safeguard you can have.

I asked for this time primarily to say that I am going to offer two amendments after this amendment has been acted on, one of which will provide as best I know how to do it, in language as carefully worked out as possible, for protection of the public interest in the matter of the disposal of patents, and the second of which has to do with that type of plant which the gentleman from Texas mentioned, which ought to be preserved in a stand-by capacity against the future national defense needs of the Nation. They will not be amendments to this amendment, but I just wanted the House to know I was going to offer them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 35, preceding section 13, in line 8 in the center of the page, insert the words, "Disposition of Plants."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: On page 35, line 10, after "aluminum" insert "or any pipe line for the transportation of oil."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, under the amendment just adopted by the Committee, it is provided that there can be no disposition of these plants costing upward of \$1,000,000 unless the board approves. That is applicable to every plant except those engaged in the production of aluminum or rubber, where one step more must be taken before the facility can be disposed of—namely, the submission to the Congress of all the

data surrounding the proposed disposition of the aluminum and rubber plants.

The amendment I have offered proposes to place this third war facility in the same category as these two industries that are being dealt with specially.

I do not know exactly how much revenue has been derived from the use of the oil pipe lines. I have been reliably informed that had the same amount of oil been shipped by rail the cost would have been exactly the same, so that we have not lost anything through this investment.

This pipe line presents to the coal and oil industries of the Nation the kind of menace that I do not believe ought to be quickly overlooked. It seems to me that before the owning agency and the board should be permitted to dispose of this line, Congress ought to be told what is proposed to be done with it. I have my own ideas. The fact of the matter is there is only one potential customer for these oil lines; that is, a natural-gas subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

In a speech recently delivered, which I discussed on Monday at length, the vice president of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio very frankly spoke about the markets, and in summing up his remarks he said:

The gas delivered through the lines would displace the coal and oil now used to manufacture artificial gas.

Having been forewarned through that very frank statement of what is intended to be done, it seems to me that the least we can require before this tremendous temporary facility is disposed of is that it be submitted to the Congress, where we can openly and with full information debate all of the aspects of this proposition.

When we think of the cost—and these Big and Little Inch lines cost a lot of money, about \$165,000,000—we should remember that since 1933 in direct relief and in work relief projects the Federal Government has expended upward of \$311,000,000, over twice the cost of this pipe line. If this pipe line is used for the transportation of natural gas, it will displace 7,000,000 man-days of work a year at a cost to our economy of between \$50,000,000 and \$60,000,000 in one year.

When the Post-War Planning Committee took up these terrific problems, the very first thing that was suggested was that we pay attention to unemployment, and that every bit of legislation suggested should be suggested only after the effect of the enactment of that legislation on employment and unemployment had been carefully considered. I cannot imagine a greater blow being struck at employment than the transfer of these oil lines to the natural gas industry.

Again we have a very limited supply of gas. The supply of oil in this country is limited. But under the mountains of Pennsylvania there is enough coal to last for upward of 1,000 years, according to the testimony of the experts. It certainly seems to me we are taking a step backward if we make possible the transfer of this facility at the expense of coal and oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state to the Committee that this amendment was adopted by the committee of which the gentleman who is about to address the House is chairman.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, that is a correct statement, but I did not support the amendment, and I thought section 13 should have been stricken from the bill, because I do not think the Congress of the United States should be the disposal agency for these surplus war plants. I represent a coal district. I have been approached by the operators and the mine workers' union to support this amendment. It puts me in a difficult position to rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, but I know something about the work of coal miners; I have worked in coal mines myself and I know something of their problems. I am just wondering if we are here today to tell every State, every county, and municipality through which this enormous pipe line passes that it will be owned by the Federal Government from now on and that that pipe line will not have to pay any taxes to help run your schools and build your highways or to carry on your public health program. If this amendment is adopted it will mean that this pipe line will never be sold; and it will not last in the ground for a thousand years. We are going to have several other amendments offered here today to this section to include plants costing over a million dollars. We will have an amendment for the magnesium plants. We will have amendments covering aluminum plants and we will probably have amendments covering aircraft plants. Under the bill as it is now written the Administrator has authority to sell parts of some of these used facilities. He can sell to some of your local concerns, we will say, 80,000 or 90,000 square feet in one of the huge aircraft factories. If this amendment and similar amendments are adopted, it would mean the Administrator under section 13 must study the problem. It would take 6 or 8 months to carry out all the suggested studies and make reports. Then it would have to lie on the Clerk's desk here for another 6 months, unless Congress acted, before any of these plants could be disposed of. What does that mean? That means we will not be able to dispose of any of these plants. That means the taxpayers of the United States will pass by these used aircraft factories, your steel plants, your rubber plants and your aluminum plants, and will see them idle, and there will be no one to give employment to the men. Of course, some people have it in their minds that probably if they are not purchased by some corporation, they will be operated by the Federal Government.

Of course, if the Congress decides to adopt a policy of Federal ownership and

operation of these plants, why, then we might just as well kiss our system of government good-bye. I think one of the primary objectives in the disposal of these plants is to see that men are given jobs in private enterprise. I am interested in the coal miners having work. But this thought has occurred to me: According to the geologists, the natural gas in this country will bleed out in the not too far distant future. I hope that the coal miners and coal operators in my district will be able to sell coal to manufacture gas to be pumped through these pipe lines. We must not just look at this picture as of today, but we must look at it in the future. I think the future of the coal industry depends largely on chemical research. I do not think we can tell the people in New York, if they want to heat their homes with natural gas, that they cannot have natural gas up there. While I do not think we should give the people who want to travel by air an advantage as compared with travel by other modes of transportation, I also do not think that the people who want to travel by air should be penalized; and these restrictive amendments would penalize the people who live in those areas which would be benefited. You know, there will be a lot of people selling gas ranges and manufacturing gas ranges and I think our coal could be used in the manufacture of these gas ranges. I think our coal would be used to haul gas ranges to these people. I am not as much disturbed over the dislocation of the coal industry as I am over the fact that the coal industry might not meet the challenge of your new chemical industry. I sincerely trust, Mr. Chairman, that all amendments to this section will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use the 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, like the chairman of the committee, I opposed this amendment. There was a difference between the pipe lines and the synthetic rubber.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to know under what rule of the House the gentleman from Mississippi has the floor. He made no pro forma motion and the 5 minutes for the amendment and the 5 minutes against the amendment have expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi moves to strike out the last two words and is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say that there is a difference between the synthetic rubber and the aluminum amendments. Synthetic rubber represents an investment of nearly a billion dollars. So does aluminum. And the question of rubber came in connection with peace negotiations and the question of the trusts came in with reference to aluminum. If we include pipe

lines there is not any good reason why we should not include the other plants. We anticipated this amendment by the adoption of the previous amendment which provides for plants costing a million dollars or more. But the Government has constructed about four pipe lines. My recollection is one of the first constructed was to connect two existing pipe lines in Texas to get oil to the Gulf, but the submarines put that out of business and you have that pipe line not used now. We constructed a small pipe line across Florida and then we constructed one to run from Greensboro, N. C., to Richmond, Va. But the big pipe line is the 20-inch and 24-inch pipe line. I make this suggestion to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that pipe line did not promote the use of gas or the use of oil as a competitor of coal. Why, they were being used along the Atlantic seaboard long before the pipe line was constructed. I live in a region where we have oil. I have been in the State of Maine and I have found petroleum products used probably more in that State than in my own State, because they have been transported up there by tankers along the Atlantic coast and along the Gulf coast. But the tankers were put out of business by the submarines and the whole purpose of this pipe line was to enable the people of the east coast to get fuel, as well as to get the oil up there for the armed forces where we could not get it by the use of tankers on account of submarines. It strikes me that this pipe-line amendment is on all fours with many other comparable agencies that were established during the war.

They did not provide for competition with coal, because after the war the oil companies may use tankers. I do not know whether the Standard Oil will use tankers or—which will be cheaper, tankers or pipe lines. I do not know what the other oil companies will do. But there are a great many oil companies, and there ought to be some competition in the purchase and use of pipe lines.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I simply wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the principal markets for coal are the homes in the Philadelphia and New York areas which are directly affected.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; and representatives in that area said that they needed fuel up there. This big pipe line was established to take the place of the tankers that we could not operate on account of the submarines.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. The difference between these pipe lines and other types of industry is that the pipe lines are natural monopolies. I do not know what should be done with them. I do not say the Government should operate them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipate the gentleman's question. We provide against monopolies. There are other pipe lines owned by corporations. We provide that they be disposed of to prevent monopolies.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the Congress should have a right to express its policy over such a large monopoly as these pipe lines.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think the coal industry is pretty well organized—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. I want to direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that there are now two war emergency pipe lines owned by the Government that convey oil from the Texas fields through several States to the Philadelphia area of Pennsylvania where the lines branch off into New York. One is a 24-inch line for crude oil. The other is a 20-inch line which parallels the 24-inch line and which conveys the products, finished, of oil.

While neither of the lines run directly through the anthracite coal-producing area, I want to point out that the proximity of Philadelphia to the hard coal region would open a direct threat to the anthracite coal market if these oil pipe lines were taken over by private interests that would endeavor to acquire any market in order to justify a return for any investment that would be made. The economic distress which has affected the hard coal industry in recent years could only be aggravated by competition from fuels transported cheaply from other States in which the controlling interests were not representative of the area in which the products are produced.

Therefore, I feel it is essential to the future economic welfare of the hard coal producing areas of Pennsylvania that the Congress of the United States adopt this amendment which would prohibit any Government agency disposing of any surplus Government-owned pipe line for the transportation of oil which cost the Government \$5,000,000 or more. And I want to point out right here that the Petroleum Administration for War estimates that the cost of the one 24-inch line from Texas to Pennsylvania and New York is \$66,000,000, and the other or 20-inch line is estimated to cost \$77,000,000. In other words the estimated cost of these two Government-owned oil lines is approximately \$143,000,000. Private control of these lines which extend through the Philadelphia area of Pennsylvania might become a direct threat to the anthracite coal-producing area. I ask for adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is opposed to the sale of these pipe lines at all?

Mr. FENTON. No; I am not opposed to the sale of the pipe lines, but I think there should be some restriction, and left to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HALE. Is not the gentleman satisfied with the restriction contained in the amendment just adopted, which was

offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

Mr. BENDER. May I answer that?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. As I stated before, the Whittington amendment is all right and in order, but it does not add anything particularly to the bill. The committee considered this proposition offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and voted almost unanimously for the adoption of this amendment. This is a committee amendment.

Mr. FENTON. That is as I understand it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the essential thing in this is precisely the point the gentleman made. There has been no means whereby the major oil companies have exerted their power over the independent producers of crude oil so effectively as by the pipe lines. The future of these big pipe lines is going to be as important as anything else in the world in regard to the distribution of fuel, and therefore I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. FENTON. I think the gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this Congress should strike a blow at the economy of the coal-mining States, among which are Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia, by refusing to adopt this amendment. I do not know what the proper disposition of these pipe lines should be, but I think that the industries and the workers affected in these coal-mining States should have a right to come to Congress and present their particular problem. I believe it is a problem that requires special treatment. The adoption of this amendment will not, as has been charged, interfere with the sale of these pipe lines. It will make it necessary that it be presented to the Congress before they are disposed of.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman understand that the cost of transporting oil by these pipe lines is somewhere around three or four times what it is to transport by tanker, and in ordinary commercial practice it would be impossible to use it in transporting oil in the regular sense of the word? I have in mind it is going to be a very difficult job for the Government to ever dispose of these pipe lines.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman may be right. I have not made a study. I think really where there is such danger as has been seen by my colleagues from Pennsylvania on both sides of the aisle, the States affected should have an opportunity to present this problem to Congress. Then if there is not any danger, let us dispose of them.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Under this amendment and the Whittington amendment it is merely provided for a sale nisi, so that the sale can be made and commitments made, and unless the Congress does something affirmatively, through legislation, within a period of 6 months, then the sale becomes final.

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, the gentleman is right. We are not prohibiting the sale. We want to have a study made before this Congress does anything which is going to adversely affect the economy of some of the most important sections of this country.

Mr. FENTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. Does the gentleman know how much oil is transported by this 24-inch pipe line?

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know. I have not made a sufficient study, but the problem is so grave that it alarms me.

Mr. FENTON. It is my understanding that approximately 300,000 barrels a day are transported by this one pipe line.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 58, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, reserving the last 5 minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will modify his request to provide that every Member offering an amendment to the section shall have at least 5 minutes in which to explain it I shall not object.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same reservation.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to this section which I desire to have considered. Unless I can be assured of the right to offer it I shall object.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, there are five amendments pending at the desk. This would allow 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against each amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 50 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 35, line 11, following the words "which cost the Government" change the figure "\$5,000,000" to read "\$1,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is the amendment to which I referred in debate with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

The section which I am endeavoring to amend reads as follows:

No Government agency shall dispose of any surplus Government-owned plant for the production of synthetic rubber or aluminum which cost the Government \$5,000,000 or more—

And so forth. I would eliminate the figures "\$5,000,000" and substitute therefor the figures "\$1,000,000."

My reason for that is because there are many units in our great synthetic rubber program which in my opinion cost less than \$5,000,000 and I fear that if my amendment is not adopted it would be possible for the Administrator, when a plant is declared surplus, to dispose of it, if it cost less than \$5,000,000.

My amendment is offered to assure the continuation of grain alcohol plants, one of which is located in my State of Nebraska. I assume other Members have some of these plants where alcohol is being manufactured from grain. I feel that these plants should be given every encouragement possible because there may come a time again when we will have a surplus of farm products. I feel that these plants have proven the argument that we in the agriculture country can find new uses for our farm products and that we can solve the myth of farm surplus through this program of farm chemistry and new uses for farm products.

We have been told that the taxpayers have about \$15,000,000,000 invested in these various plants. I assume we have close to \$1,000,000,000 invested in the 49 or more plants which have something to do in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. Perhaps we have the same amount invested in aluminum plants.

We did not get these synthetic rubber plants without great difficulty. There were many, many hearings by the Gillette committee. There were various pieces of legislation introduced. One including my own bill which had to do with the manufacture of synthetic rubber from grain products. There was much opposition from special interests. But we finally won and we have succeeded in making rubber from American products. This was all done at a time when we were at war and when most of the natural rubber supply was cut off from us by our enemies. We constructed all kinds of plants where material was made for synthetic-rubber manufacture. We built alcohol plants where alcohol was made from farm products; from coal and petroleum products; from

the guayule weed and other things. We built plants close to the point of farm production and for the first time we gave hope to the farmer that his products had many new uses.

How successful have we been? The recent report of the rubber director indicates that at the end of this year our synthetic rubber plants will be turning out more than 860,000 tons of rubber. That is far more rubber than we use normally. We are even exporting some of our rubber to our allies. In spite of the fact that our enemies have control over most of the natural rubber plantations, we are now self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned.

There is a bright possibility that the end of the war in Europe will come during this calendar year. So we are here today working on legislation to dispose of nearly \$100,000,000,000 worth of surplus plants, property, land, ships, and all kinds of material. The legislation is designed so that there will be no repetition of the disgraceful things that happened after the First World War. We are legislating now with the objective that this property will be fed back into our economic channels in such a way that it will not destroy our post-war economy. We are endeavoring to legislate so that no monopolies, no special interests can take advantage of this huge surplus which belongs to the taxpayer.

But special interests are at work, Mr. Chairman. I sincerely believe that there are international cartels and certain forces at work at this very moment. Interests which have as their objective the destruction of the gains we have made in the program of new uses for farm products. It is my sincere and honest belief that the natural-rubber-producing governments are at work right now with the objective to induce us to scrap our synthetic rubber plants. This feeling must have been shared in by members of the committee who so wisely wrote into this bill the words:

No Government agency shall dispose of any surplus Government-owned plant for the production of synthetic rubber or aluminum.

There must have been some feeling in the committee that perhaps it would be wise that before such disposal is attempted that the agencies come to Congress for such permission. But the committee added the words "which cost the Government \$5,000,000 or more."

I feel that this figure may become a joker in the disposal program because there are plants costing less than that amount which perhaps could be disposed of. And that would include, in my opinion, some of the smaller plants scattered over the various States. These are small plants, but they are an integral part of the link which has made our synthetic rubber program successful.

The gentleman from Mississippi has had an amendment adopted which would restrain disposal of plants costing \$1,000,000 or more until the advisory committee or Congress has an opportunity to view the situation and give approval or disapproval. That is a helpful amendment, but, in my opinion, it does not protect these rubber or aluminum

plants. I feel my amendment would strengthen the Whittington amendment and give double assurance that these smaller plants would be given some real protection. I feel every safeguard we can put into this bill will strengthen the farm chemurgy program and inspire those who feel that we are now on the threshold of an era of new uses for farm products. An era which I predict will eventually solve the perplexing distribution and transportation problems. An era during which I predict we will see more processing of farm products close to the point of production.

I urge favorable action on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 22, noes 35.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 36, line 24, add a new subsection as follows:

"Whenever the Administrator or any disposal agency shall begin negotiations for the sale or transfer to private interests of a patent the Administrator or disposal agency shall promptly notify the Attorney General of the proposed sale or transfer and the probable terms or conditions thereof. Within a reasonable time after receiving such notification the Attorney General shall advise the Administrator or disposal agency whether the proposed sale or transfer will either violate the antitrust laws or encourage monopoly or undue concentration of industry or commerce or restrain competition substantially."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The section under consideration has to do with the disposal of surplus Government-owned plants. There is nothing in any part of the section that has to do with patents. It is an entirely different subject matter that is not covered by this section. It strikes me that the amendment is not germane to the section or to any part of the section because we have no provision here for patents.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Surely the gentleman from Mississippi does not contend that it is impossible to place an amendment in this bill governing the disposal of patents. There is no more important type of property involved for Government disposal than patents.

As to whether or not my amendment is germane to the section we are now considering, I submit to the Chairman only that I know of no better place to offer it in the bill than at the place where I am offering it, because this section provides for the disposal of Government

plants. I do not find any other general heading in the bill where I think the amendment would fit so well as it fits here. Surely the Chair would not rule that it was impossible to insert a provision in this bill having to do with the disposal of patents. If the Chair does not so rule then it is my contention that this is as appropriate a place to offer it as any.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the indulgence of the Chair, may I state further that section 10 (a) of this bill provides for the disposal of all surplus property of the Government and the section under consideration applies to the disposal of Government plants. If the Government has any patents or other property to dispose of it should be handled under section 10, not the present section, and if not under section 10, then under a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment has to do with the disposition of patents. The subject matter of the entire bill is the disposal of surplus Government property. Section 13 of the bill confines itself to the disposal of plants.

The Chair holds that the amendment would be and is germane to the bill but is not germane to section 13.

The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from California that in the opinion of the Chair it would be in order to offer it as a new section following section 13.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 36, line 24, add a new section as follows:

"(3) In cases of plants or facilities suitable only for the manufacture of arms or ammunition of war title to such property shall in all cases be retained in the Government and such property shall either be maintained as stand-by production capacity or operated directly by the Army or Navy or leased for operation by a private contractor or contractors for the production of ammunition or munitions for the Army or Navy of the United States, or civilian goods: *Provided*, That if leased for the production of civilian goods the lease or leases shall provide for and safeguard the right of recapture in the event of national need."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals solely with those plants that were erected by the Government for the production of munitions or ammunition, wartime necessities. Hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money has been expended in such construction. It is entirely conceivable that after the war it will not be necessary for all of those plants to be kept in operation for the production of arms or ammunition; but it seems to me that it might be vital to our Nation that they be kept as standby plants for the purpose of resuming such production in case of war. Such foresight would not only protect us against such a lethal contingency but would save billions of dollars that would be wasted by the for-

mer procedure—building extravagantly under the high pressure of the war emergency, then junking and rebuilding just as wastefully when a new emergency comes.

During the peace period, when they are kept in standby condition and not allowed to deteriorate, they might be leased for the production of civilian goods. The recapture clause in the leases would assure their availability when needed. Leave them standing there, keep them in standby condition, without expense to the Government, and plus a return on the investment. Provide employment, get the benefits of the civilian goods produced, and if and when war again requires their use, they will be ready. That makes sense, does it not? Otherwise you will not realize one cent on the dollar, and you know it. Also, you are assured another crop of war millionaires. Then another crop of war millionaires when they have to be rebuilt. And so on, ad infinitum. Build them, junk them, then rebuild them. That is the formula of our policy.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Always I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman knows I am heartily in favor of his amendment. I would like to remark that had the policy outlined in the gentleman's amendment been followed after World War No. 1 we might well have saved hundreds of millions of dollars when this present war came on us.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I wonder if the gentleman should not define "national need" more clearly in his amendment. National need might not just mean war. The President may say that an emergency exists and that would require the Government taking over the plant in peacetime. Should we let it hang in midair to that extent and permit the President to take over those plants in peacetime by declaring that a national emergency required this action?

Mr. HOBBS. I will be glad to answer the question. My reason for leaving it that way and my reason for using those words was this: We probably will police the world for at least two generations. There would be a need to run these munition plants in acting as the arsenal of democracy, especially for the 21 American republics. There might be such a need which would have to be served, but it would not be war. I believe we can safely entrust this recapture power to the administrator or board set up in this bill, and I believe that there is nothing to fear on that score because they are not going to take them over except there is a recurrence of need to produce ammunition or munitions. It would not be feasible to limit that term "national need" strictly to the declaration of emergency, or to war.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I wanted the gentleman to say. We should not leave this thing in such a position, or

leave the record in such shape that it would indicate the Congress felt that these plants could be taken over in peacetime for anything other than the protection of the Nation.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is located in the district I represent a small-arms ammunition plant, stated many times to be the largest in the world. The production has already been curtailed in connection with the manufacturing of small-arms ammunition in that plant. When the war is over we will not be able to retain all those places and keep them operating. This plant cost over \$100,000,000. If it is going to be used by the Government, I do not know what it can be used for. It might be, it could be, least to say, probably a hundred industries purchase parts of this plant. The plant I refer to is located within the boundaries of the city of St. Louis.

We do not want that plant lying idle. At the present time we get no taxes for the large amount of ground occupied by the Government. We want the plant to operate. The Government is not going to need all of these ammunition plants that we have now. Of course, it is true we will maintain some of them, but when the war is over we will have a supply of ammunition in storage which will last us for many, many years in peacetimes. We are not conducting this war on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that it is absolutely impossible to deal intelligently with these plants on a mass basis; that each individual case has to be passed upon by itself?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, there is another part of this amendment that should not be overlooked. If the provisions of this amendment are to be carried out, then where is the argument that we do not want the Government competing with private business? Private business has been manufacturing the great bulk of the necessities of the Government during peacetime and private business should continue to operate during peacetime to supply the Government. How about clothing? This amendment will put the Government in business competing with your commercial plants and my commercial plants.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It does not apply to clothing at all. All the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] does is cover plants which can only be used for the manufacture of munitions of war, plants which are only suitable for that purpose. Those are the only kinds of plants covered.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If these plants are needed after the war, they will not be declared surplus by the War Department.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The proposed amendment would reverse every program enunciated in the policies of this bill and require us to maintain stand-by plants instead of disposing of these plants.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. The amendment does not provide for operation by the Government for any purpose except manufacturing ammunition or munitions. Anything else that might be made would be manufactured and sold by private lessees.

Mr. COCHRAN. All right. Let us take this plant that is operating in wartime. The Government is not operating the plant. The Government owns it and every piece of machinery in it, but it has leased the plant to a cartridge company which is operating that plant for the Government. If the Government does not operate that plant in wartime why should the Government operate it in peacetime?

Mr. HOBBS. This amendment does not require the Government to operate any plant. We need the safety which the retention of the title to such plants would give us, subject to the right of recapture, in case of need. We need this additional safety. In the meantime we would get some return upon the Government's investment, if the Government had no need to operate, and leased them to private concerns for making civilian goods. We will not have the Government bilked, as it has been in every war so far, by having to rush in every time there is a cloud on the horizon, and at enormous cost rebuild these facilities post haste, because we had allowed them to be junked.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not want that plant to be lying idle in my district, and I am sure the people of the city of St. Louis do not want it to be lying idle either.

Mr. HOBBS. I have stated the purposes of the amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LARCADE: Page 36, line 21, strike out "This" and insert "The foregoing provisions of this", and after line 24, insert the following:

"(1) No surplus Government-owned plant shall be dismantled, or be disposed of to any

person who does not expect to operate such plant at the place where it is located, unless the State and political subdivision in which such plant is located have been given a reasonable opportunity to acquire such plant. If the State or political subdivision does desire to acquire such plant, the Administrator is authorized to provide for the acceptance by the disposal agency in payment therefor of bonds, certificates of indebtedness, excess-revenue certificates, or other evidences of indebtedness, of the State or political subdivision, bearing interest at the rate of not more than 3 percent per annum and maturing in not more than 40 years from the date of issue."

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is self-explanatory. I believe that all of us who have war industries established in our districts in the various sections of the country want to see them maintained and want to see them operated in order to give employment to our people and the returning veterans when they come back from the war. It is my opinion that there may be instances where private enterprise will not purchase these plants. My amendment provides that a municipality or any political subdivision of the Government, after all effort has been made to dispose of these plants in the various communities where they are located, and with the condition that they shall be operated by the purchaser, if they have been unable to find a purchaser within a reasonable time, should be given opportunity to purchase them. To give as an example, in the city of Lake Charles, the largest city in my district, we have a very fine port. On account of the natural advantages of my section and that port the Government established more than \$200,000,000 worth of war industries, the foremost of which are a magnesium plant, a synthetic rubber plant, high-octane gasoline, and butadiene plant, and other plants, and in addition in other sections of my district, through the Defense Plants Corporation, there have been established other industries which we are fearful we may lose unless some provision is made to protect us in this respect, under the bill now under consideration. We have the same situation in all other sections of the United States. There may be an airport established adjoining some municipality or some city. After the war the Government may find that it no longer has any need for that facility. I think it would be a good thing if the municipality would be given an opportunity to purchase and operate this airport rather than have it abandoned and that facility lost to the people of that community.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Of course, this section does not embrace airports because it has to do with war plants such as the gentleman says he has in his district.

Mr. LARCADE. I am particularly concerned with war industries in my district. As my distinguished colleague from Mississippi will recall, during the administration of Governor White in the

great State of Mississippi many industries were established just by this method of the municipality voting taxes, in order to attract industry.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There would be no prohibition in this bill against that course under this bill.

Mr. LARCADE. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague also stated that up to this time there has been only one plant taking advantage of the option to repurchase, and, further, that it was his opinion that possibly no further options would be exercised for the purchase of these plants. Naturally we want to conserve these plants. We want to see the Government get back some of this money. For example, the magnesium plant which was constructed in my district, in the city of Lake Charles, was one of the disappointing features, and one of the black marks on the program of the Defense Plants Corporation. Fifty-four million dollars of Federal funds were spent to establish that industry in Lake Charles, and on account of faulty construction and faulty engineering the plant never did operate satisfactorily and never was successful, having only operated to one-half of its capacity, and it is estimated that it cannot be put in condition where it can be profitably operated. In other words, it is in such bad shape that this plant cannot be operated on a competitive basis. Certainly the Government should try to get some salvage out of a plant of that kind. We do not want to lose that plant if we can help it. If we are not able to get the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co. or the Dow Chemical Co. to make some kind of an arrangement with the Government for the purchase of this plant, the chances are that it will be dismantled, which would be a great industrial loss to our city.

This amendment is one that I think should appeal to all of the Members, because these war plants are scattered throughout the length and breadth of our country. I believe that all municipalities and political subdivisions should be given an opportunity to purchase these plants after all effort has been made to sell these plants to private enterprise, in order to preserve them where located and to conserve these plants, in order that they may be operated to give employment to our people. I hope the Members will give favorable consideration to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman has been perfectly frank with respect to his amendment. The gentleman has a unique proposition. His amendment provides for the continuance of plants that have not been operated and that are absolutely impractical to operate.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. I am afraid the gentleman misunderstood my point. I am not trying to provide for the operation of plants that have never produced. I am trying to provide for my municipality to purchase a plant that has operated but is not being operated now.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understood the gentleman to say that that particular plant was never operated and it was found impractical to operate it. That was what I understood the gentleman to say. However, the distinction is immaterial.

Mr. LARCADE. My point is that the plant is there and that it is available for purchase, and rather than dismantle it and have it moved away, our municipality should be given an opportunity to purchase it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If it is declared to be surplus it can be disposed of, and your people or municipalities can acquire it under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER: Page 35, line 12, after the word "therefore", strike out the period, substitute a comma, and add the following: "given or entered into prior to June 23, 1944, and which option shall be held by the Attorney General as binding on the United States."

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat disturbed about that very broad exception contained in section 13, which is the heart of the section, and to which has been added some other material that seems to me to be of somewhat doubtful relevancy. All of the amendments that we have voted upon, some favorable and some unfavorable, relate themselves to the provisions of this section, but from every bit of it is excepted and taken out any plant or property that is or might be optioned to someone else or pursuant to an option; that is, if an option has been entered into or shall be entered into at any time, then the Congress or the Government must respect that option and this section 13 would not apply to any property upon which an option has been given.

The 23d of June 1944 is the date of the introduction of this bill. Therefore, I wrote in the amendment, "Any option entered into prior to June 23, 1944." Then it occurred to me that there might be options lightly entered into but which were very detrimental to the Government's best interests, and that any option, before it is accepted as binding upon the Congress and upon the Government, ought to be held by the Attorney General as binding upon the United States, and, then, of course, we would have to abide by it.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Do I correctly understand the amendment to mean that when an option was entered into with one of the corporations operating some of these aircraft factories prior to June 23, 1944, the Attorney General would have authority to rule whether or not that was a legal, binding contract?

Mr. FOLGER. That addition does mean that.

Mr. MANASCO. It is the gentleman's opinion that a contract entered into in good faith by one of the operating agencies could be declared invalid by the Attorney General?

Mr. FOLGER. Invalid?

Mr. MANASCO. That would be the effect of it.

Mr. FOLGER. Only in the event the Attorney General found it was illegal or that something had entered into it that ought not to have been there, and he could not approve it.

Mr. MANASCO. Could not that be done under existing law if a contract is contrary to public policy?

Mr. FOLGER. I imagine the committee put this in because it recognized that there are probably outstanding options on some property—how much the committee probably did not know, and I do not know anything about it, but that was put in because the committee felt it was binding. But if, as a matter of fact, it turns out that it was not a binding option, one that the United States ought to be bound by, we ought to give ourselves a chance to say so at some period before the whole matter is closed out. Under this provision it could be done even if the option was illegal, because the Congress says this section shall not apply to any property that is under an option. That is all there is to it. We should reserve the power of examination of any options, and if found to be harmful to the Government—and for any valid reason not binding on the Government—the same should not be recognized.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment is wholly unnecessary. Section 13 (a) contemplates that the Government agency may dispose of surplus Government plants pursuant to an option for such disposal. I think the word "option" must be construed to mean a legal and valid option. The only effect of the amendment would be to have the Attorney General decide whether the option was valid. It seems to me the Attorney General would there go beyond his proper function, for it must be presumed that the contracts the United States has entered into are valid contracts and that the United States intends to perform them in good faith.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Any contract that contains an option was evidently passed upon by both the attorneys for the governmental agency and the attorneys for the operating agency, and it ought to be binding on both of them no matter what the opinion of the Attorney General might be, because it has been passed on.

Mr. HALE. I take it for granted that that must be so. The amendment would appear to stultify the whole contract-making process of the United States.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Is it not apparent also that the option, which of course means a valid, legal option, must have been entered into at the time of the making of the original contract, for it is the purpose of this bill to give somebody some power to do something about it now? In other words, there could not have been a valid option granted unless it had been granted at the time of or contemporaneously with the execution of the original contract.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. Does the language of this section refer to options entered into at the time the contract was originally made, or any option entered into at any time?

Mr. HALE. It presumably refers to any option validly granted by the United States, whether in the original contract or in some supplement thereto.

Mr. FOLGER. Then is there any harm in allowing the Attorney General, whoever he may be, to look into this and see if he thinks it to be a binding, valid option?

Mr. HALE. The Attorney General has presumably looked into it already. I presume the United States does not enter into any contract inadvisedly or lightly.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. If the Attorney General finds that the option is illegal, then the courts of the United States may decide otherwise, and finally it would have to be left to the determination of the courts.

Mr. HALE. It seems to me it is only a matter of decency to allow the party who holds an option to go to court and not try to foreclose him with the Attorney General, or have the Attorney General intervene against him.

Mr. FOLGER. Is not the opinion of the Attorney General law until the courts hold differently?

Mr. HALE. I think that is going rather far.

Mr. FOLGER. It is in my State, I know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 36, line 24, add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 14. Whenever the Administrator or any disposal agency shall begin negotiations for the sale or transfer to private interests of a patent, the Administrator or disposal agency shall promptly notify the Attorney General of the proposed sale or transfer and the probable terms or conditions thereof. Within a reasonable time after receiving such notification the Attorney General shall advise the Administrator or disposal agency whether the proposed sale or transfer will either violate the antitrust laws, or encourage monopoly or undue concentration of industry or commerce or restrain competition substantially."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment I earnestly hope the Committee will accept. I see no reason the Committee should not accept it. The language I am offering is language which, I am informed, is already included in the proposed Senate bill, with the exception of the word "patents", and I am inclined to believe from the information at my command that that word will be included in the Senate bill as well.

Without this amendment there is not a single provision in this whole bill that says one word about what is going to happen to the large number of patents, some of them of the greatest importance, which have been taken over by the Government as a result of the taking over of patents belonging to enemy corporations during the war.

The whole question as to whether or not patents are going to be sold, for example, to the Sterling Products Co., or somebody else in the drug monopoly, is involved in this question. At least before patents are disposed of the Attorney General should be informed so that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice can examine the situation and can make a determination as to whether the sale of that patent will violate the antitrust laws or add unduly to monopolistic control. That is all my amendment does. It only requires that the Attorney General must be informed and that he must have an opportunity to make a statement as to whether the sale violates the antitrust laws or whether or not it would add to monopolistic control on the part of a certain corporation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. No patents are going to be sold other than those that have been taken over by the Alien Property Custodian. Is not that right?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is not the Alien Property Custodian a part of the Department of Justice?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not so far as I know.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it separate and distinct now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As far as I know.

Mr. COCHRAN. It was a part of the Department of Justice at one time. I recall it is now a separate agency under an Executive order. Does not the gentleman know they have already sold a lot of patents?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; and I am alarmed about the matter. I will say to the gentleman, very deeply alarmed about it. If it be true that he is a part of the Department of Justice, then what possible objection could there be to the adoption of my amendment?

I just cannot understand why there should be any reason in the world for opposing a proposal to get the sale of patents out into the open, where people can know what is going on. That is all this amendment proposes to do.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. MANASCO. Under the terms of the bill, the Attorney General is a member of the board, and he certainly can advise the Surplus Property Administrator if any antitrust laws have been violated, and also under the terms of the bill the Surplus Property Administrator must make reports to the Congress, so that the public will be advised.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand, but I just do not believe that reports to Congress every quarter are going to be effective in taking care of the situation after the horse is already stolen. I do not know what is going to happen. I agree that my philosophy about this matter is a little different than the philosophy of some other Members. I want to prevent some of these things before they happen, not afterward. I think this amendment would be very salutary from that point of view.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. I took the position in the committee that section 12 was entirely unnecessary. Section 12 provides that no part of the antitrust laws in any manner, shape, or form are set aside under the provisions of this bill. Therefore, if we are not setting aside any of the antitrust laws under the provisions of the bill, I do not think that paragraph ought to be in there, for we are not disturbing the antitrust laws.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand, but my amendment is broader than that. It requires a statement on the part of the Department of Justice as to whether or not the sale of this patent would increase monopolistic control in an industry, which is a little bit broader question. I hope that the House is not going to declare, by turning this amendment down, in effect, that it does not have any concern about what is going to happen about these patents, because I warn you, Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important single questions involved in this whole proposition of the disposal of Government-owned property at the present time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not one of the policies and one of the objectives of this bill to prevent monopoly?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And does not the bill state it shall not impinge upon antitrust laws?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the difficulty with the gentleman's amendment is that it undertakes to hedge about with such technicalities the sale of a patent and thus might prevent the sale of a patent where it was desirable to do so?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not think it would prevent the sale of a

single patent except in the case where I do not think that patents ought to be sold to the corporation to which it is proposed to be sold. Furthermore, I will answer the gentleman's statement in this manner, as I have answered it before over and over again in connection with amendments which I have offered to this bill. It is true that the statement of policy which the committee put in the bill is to accomplish exactly the purpose my amendment would accomplish. All I am trying to do is to make as certain and as sure as I know how, that the purposes which the committee itself set before us will actually be realized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VOORHIS of California) there were—ayes 22, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANGER: Page 36, after line 24, insert a new section as follows:

"STRATEGIC MINERALS AND METALS

"SEC. 14. All Government-owned accumulations of strategic minerals and metals, including those owned by any Government corporation, shall be transferred by the owning agency, when determined to be surplus pursuant to this act, to the account of the Treasury Procurement Division and shall be added to the stock pile authorized by the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, and shall be subject to its provisions. The minerals and metals may be transferred in any form in which they are held, and they shall thereafter be put into forms best suited for storage and use for the common defense. As used in this section the phrase "strategic minerals and metals" means all minerals and metals included in either group A or group B of the list of strategic and critical materials determined upon by the Army and Navy Munitions Board on March 6, 1944, and any other minerals or metals which said Board determines should be added to group A or group B, and shall include ores, concentrates, alloys, scrap, and partially and completely fabricated articles of which the principal components by value consist of such minerals and metals, but shall not include such fabricated articles as the Army and Navy determine are not suitable for their use in the form in which fabricated and which may be disposed of commercially at value substantially in excess of the metal market price of the component minerals and metals of such fabricated articles. Transfers under this section shall be made without reimbursement or transfer of funds except that, if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries is the owning agency for any property so transferred, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in an amount equal to the cost of the property so transferred."

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not original with me, but it is one in which I have a very decided conviction that it should be considered and adopted by the committee. During the period before, and during the war it seems as if we thought we were doing a great service to the country if we exploited our natural resources, and we seem to have a notion that they are inexhaustible. Some day we are going to

wake up and find out that the forests we so lavishly utilized, and our soils to which we give so little attention, and the minerals in the good earth, may not be as everlasting and as inexhaustible as we have supposed. This amendment is couched in practically the same language that will be in a bill considered in another body, dealing with this same subject. In 1939, the Congress of the United States passed what we called a stock-piling bill for the accumulation of strategic and critical materials. No one knows, up to this time, how much those stock piles have been depleted and no one can tell now, should the emergency arise, where these same strategic metals and materials could be obtained. The purpose of this amendment is to make sure that should another emergency arise, as the one we have experienced, this country would not find itself entirely unprepared to meet the emergency.

I am unable to give the Committee, for security reasons, the complete list of strategic materials that have been so declared. Likewise, I am not in a position to tell the value of the surplus property that might be offered for sale, but this I do know, that the policy of maintaining a stock pile should not be abandoned. This amendment is not, and should not be considered from the standpoint of doing a favor to some favored class. Primarily it is in the interest of national security. Indirectly, it will be of assistance to the mining industry of the West, which has done such a noble job in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman's amendment contemplate every critical material other than the war minerals and metals?

Mr. GRANGER. The amendment only contemplates critical material and strategic metals. It is confined to metals entirely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mining products?

Mr. GRANGER. Mining products.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am heartily in sympathy with the intent of this amendment and wish we might have more time to consider it.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman. I had hoped that the Committee would accept this amendment. I believe it is of the utmost importance. It is important in the security of our Nation. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment. If not, I trust the membership will vote to make the amendment part of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Naturally, Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the gentleman from Utah. I assume he comes from a mining district. But what is this bill going to be if everybody representing some special privilege from his own district comes in here and tries to protect those particular interests? I have never heard of the War or Navy Departments asking for any such amendment. I have heard of no one

from either the War Department or the Navy Department asking for it. The gentleman comes in here and asks that these strategic materials, which include practically every product of the mines, be frozen; and if the amendment should be adopted there would be nothing left to sell. The greatest surplus of all probably will be copper and aluminum and so on down the line. You might just as well scrap this bill, or let us make it wide open for everybody—let all the farmers and businessmen and every other interest come in here as a matter of special privilege, and write into the bill something to protect their particular interest. Then we would have no bill at all.

We have been dragging along here for 3 or 4 days. I am not complaining. The gentleman has a right to represent his district, and I am sure he is doing it well, but, on the other hand, we are representing the entire country and the welfare of the Nation as a whole. We have been listening to this debate for 3 or 4 days, dragging along, with all these special privilege proposals under consideration. I think the Members of Congress are ready to vote. I think they have been ready to vote for a long time. If I have any criticism it is with the proponents of the bill who have been taking too much time on the amendments.

I have great reliance on the intelligence, wisdom, and Americanism of the Members of Congress to see through the purpose of these amendments. Therefore, I have taken this occasion to oppose this amendment and other amendments of special privilege, and to ask that this bill be expedited.

The people back home have been asking for this bill for some time. I am a member of the committee that started studying this bill 3 months ago. We did the very best we could to bring in a national bill—an American bill—to dispose of surplus property, but if everybody is going to take the time of the House to bring in special privilege amendments we will never get through and we will get nowhere. This is no criticism of the gentleman from Utah himself because I know and everybody else knows he is representing the best interest of his own district but I want to make sure that the other Members of Congress know what the amendment is about. It is to freeze these strategic materials. Nobody has asked for it except the gentleman from Utah. If we start to do that we might as well withdraw the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I have offered several amendments to this bill and I challenge the gentleman to find one single evidence of any special interest or anything to do with my district about one of them.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman speaks for himself. I do not know his amendments, but I am glad that is the fact.

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman surely would not have the Government

of the United States sell strategic materials that we do not produce in this country, for which the Congress provided legislation.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman's amendment is absolutely wide open. It takes in almost every mining product. If the gentleman would limit it to tin or something that we do not produce in this country, that might be an entirely different matter. The gentleman includes copper and aluminum which we are producing in enormous quantities, with large surpluses. It takes in all of them. It does not merely take in strategic materials that we do not produce in America. It might be entirely different if the Government or the War Department wanted to preserve the tin which we do not produce here. That would be something different. But, it is a grab-all proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before I vote on the bill I want to be sure that I understand two amendments which have been adopted in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] can tell me if I am correct in believing that under the Mott amendment which was adopted yesterday there will be no Navy surplus material sold by the Administrator provided for in this bill, but it will have to be sold by the Navy Department itself?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. Under the ruling of the Administrator you cannot sell surplus beans in the Navy without going through the Navy Department. Utterly contrary to every other provision of this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Then for all practical purposes we have taken Navy surpluses out of the control of the Administrator of this act?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely, because the War Food Administrator may handle all other food, but not so when you come to the Navy. It has to be handled by the Navy and the Navy alone.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I could hardly believe that I understood that amendment correctly but that is the way I interpreted it.

The other amendment about which I am uncertain is the Pace amendment. Could the gentleman enlighten me a little about the Pace amendment which was adopted last Friday? Under the Pace amendment can surplus bacon, for instance, or any foodstuff of any kind raised on the farm, be sold at less than parity price, or the price now being set by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman by saying that the members of the committee were advised that the Pace amendment really did not authorize anything to be done that was not already authorized under existing law. That is the information and advice we had from the general counsel.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is my understanding that the Pace amendment pro-

vides that surplus materials held by Government agencies could be sold for export at prices below parity.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman by repeating what I said, that that amendment was submitted to the Administrator, or to his general counsel, and we were advised by him that that could be done under existing law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, let us see. It is not my understanding that the present law now in force would permit Government agencies to sell these accumulated foodstuffs at prices below parity. I may be in error in that. If that is true, that is news to me.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is the interpretation that was placed on the bill. I can only repeat what the general counsel said.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The point I was trying to get clear is that I hoped the Pace amendment would not interfere with the orderly disposal of foodstuffs that will be on hand when the war ends.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It will be understood that it would not. For instance, to give an illustration, under the Pace amendment and under the law as it is now, only a certain amount of cotton can be disposed of per month. We were advised that that law would obtain and the Pace amendment did not change it.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure if it has the approval of the committee it is all right, but the chairman will recall it was passed on last Friday in the closing minutes of the session, and I was uncertain as to how far-reaching the Pace amendment would prove to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked to extend my remarks at this point in the Record, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] because the time is fixed, and therefore no time is permissible for me on the floor of the House on this amendment. I had considered offering some such amendment myself, but hesitated to do so under the circumstances and because of the lack of time in which to consider so important and intricate a subject. Five minutes to favor such a provision as offered here is not sufficient time to indicate its tremendous importance. It should be adopted.

The purpose of the gentleman's amendment, as I see it, is to provide for stock-piling the strategic and critical minerals and metals. As he indicated to me, he does not include non-mineral or any perishable product. Now the terms "strategic and critical minerals" have a very definite meaning, as both terms have been defined by the War Department, and the most important so-called war minerals have been named and classified under these terms.

Mr. Chairman, the action we have taken today on several amendments proposed would lead one to believe that the Members of this body do not consider that there will ever be another war involving America. Well, I hope there will never be another war, and I certainly feel that there should not be another war within the lifetime of any human being now alive. But who is going to give us that assurance? Of course, it has been said here repeatedly that this property is not surplus until it is declared surplus by the owning agency. Presumably, the War Department will see to keeping on hand a sufficient reserve for our national defense, but I can think of several kinds of this war property which will be declared surplus the moment the guns cease firing. For all present military purposes it will be surplus, and the War Department will probably so declare it, but Congress ought to look ahead in national defense, even farther ahead than the War Department is expected to do.

When the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] offered his amendment a while ago concerning munition plants I had a strong feeling that title in such plants should remain in the Government and some of them kept reserved as standby plants for the Nation's safety, while most of them could be turned to civilian production and leased to private operation for the production of civilian and peacetime goods.

Much depends upon the character of the property as to whether it lends itself to stock-piling, but there is no question about the indestructible elements from the earth being possible of stock-piling without deterioration or loss. Not only should we consider the effect of such stock-piling on the internal economy of the country, but we ought to profit from past blunders of dumping and not repeat them. The very worst feature of our early unpreparedness, and it had many bad features, was the lack of sufficient reserves or stock piles of these strategic and critical war minerals in 1939. True, a beginning was made in 1937, but it was not sufficient for defense needs in spite of the object lesson of the First World War; therefore, our Nation has been caught in the opening of two terrible wars lacking the very things that are used to fight modern wars. Unless this bill is amended in somewhat the way suggested by the gentleman from Utah, or unless the War Department does the thing for which it will probably be criticized by some, or unless the Administrator uses his head, we could easily be caught unprepared the third time. I do not see how you can fight a modern war without copper, zinc, steel, or manganese, and the like. But when hostilities cease there will be such a demand for these things for the production of civilian goods that industry will take every bit above ground, even though the mining industry might be able to furnish currently all that would be needed in peacetime production.

My understanding is that in copper alone we have now four or five times as much as would be called for in peacetime in a year's production. It would be "duck soup" for the fabricators in the

production of civilian goods to have all this dumped upon the market and the price smashed thereby. However, it would close down every copper mine in the country and turn these mining camps into ghost towns, as I saw them turned several years ago. Disregarding the military preparedness phase of it and thinking only of the domestic economy, such a policy would be penny-wise and pound-foolish. We must not take chances.

One gentleman criticized that Member of Congress who lets the thought of the condition of his own district govern him in such large questions. I suppose I am to be criticized then for thinking of copper. I wonder if the gentleman from New York knows where the copper comes from which is used so extensively in the manufacturing in the Northeast. Let me tell the gentleman that if he wants to make this country totally dependent upon some foreign country for this essential commodity, I know of no better way to do it than to disregard the existence of this great surplus, some of which has come from abroad under war requirements, and let it foolishly be dumped upon the market. Oh, yes; you can get cheap raw material for a while, but at what a price.

I do trust that some such provision as contained in the Granger amendment shall become a part of this enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALE: On page 36, line 24, after section 13, insert a new section to read:

"SEC. 14. Disposition of airports. No airport shall be disposed of as surplus property until it has first been offered for sale or lease to the State or municipality in which it is situated and to all contiguous municipalities."

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I believe the purpose of this amendment is sufficiently clear. The airports have been constructed by the Government and they are very valuable property. It seems to me to go without saying that no airport should be cut up into house lots or exposed to the mercies of ambitious realtors until the communities in which the airport is situated and contiguous communities have had an opportunity to acquire any facilities not needed by the Government.

This situation was brought to my attention by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] who called attention to the fact that there is an airport in his district which the city of Syracuse might wish to acquire by lease or sale if by any chance the Government should declare it surplus property.

I believe it requires no argument to say that these airports should not be split up but should be retained as airports as long as there is any chance of any State or political subdivision thereof using them as airports.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And there would be no inhibition against the Fed-

eral Government or Federal agencies transferring from one to the other to be maintained by them. If that is not done the gentleman's amendment contemplates that they may be acquired by the State or local subdivision of government before they are split up.

Mr. HALE. That is what it amounts to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 1:

"REGULATIONS"

"SEC. 14. The Administrator shall prescribe regulations to effectuate the provisions of this act. Each Government agency shall carry out regulations of the administrator expeditiously and shall issue such regulations with respect to its operations and procedures as may be necessary for that purpose. Any Government agency may issue such further regulations not inconsistent with the regulations of the Administrator as it deems necessary and desirable to carry out the provisions of this act. The regulations prescribed under this act shall be published in the Federal Register."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 37, line 5, strike out "regulations with respect" and strike out lines 6 and 7.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it unnecessary for the departments to publish in the Federal Register every intradepartmental regulation or instruction to an employee in the field. Under the section as amended, all regulations affecting the disposal of property must be published in the Federal Register. It is feared this might include intradepartmental memoranda or instructions to field personnel.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman's amendment as I took it down reads: "Strike out regulations with respect"; and strike out lines 6 and 7. If you strike out lines 6 and 7 you go beyond the period and strike out "any Government agency may issue such."

Mr. MANASCO. It still leaves the regulations for disposal subject to publication in the Federal Register.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 37, line 13:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS"

"SEC. 15. (a) Each Government agency shall submit to the Administrator (1) such information and reports with respect to surplus property in its control, in such form and at such times as the Administrator may direct; and (2) information and reports with respect to other property in its control, to such extent, and in such form as the agency deems consistent with national security.

"(b) Any Government agency may execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property or take such other action as it deems necessary or proper to

transfer or dispose of property or otherwise to carry out the provisions of this act, and, in the case of surplus property, shall do so to the extent required by the regulations of the Administrator.

"(c) Where any property is disposed of in accordance with this act and any regulations prescribed under this act, no officer or employee of the Government shall (1) be liable with respect to such disposition except for his own fraud or (2) be accountable for the collection of any purchase price which is determined to be uncollectible by the agency responsible therefor.

"(d) Any Government agency responsible for the care and handling of any property may take such action for the care and handling of such property, and for completion of any semifabricated property, as it deems necessary or desirable to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

"(e) Each disposal agency shall maintain in each of its disposal offices such records of its inventories of surplus property and of each disposal transaction negotiated by that office as the Administrator may prescribe. The information in such records shall be available at all reasonable times for public inspection.

"(f) Nothing in this act shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract or any term or provision of any contract without the consent of the contractor, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

"(g) In disposing of surplus agricultural lands in the United States, former owners shall be given a reasonable time, to be fixed by the Administrator, in which to repurchase their original tracts, at a price not exceeding that paid them by the Government, except where the value of such tract has been increased by the Government. Except for the above provisions, such land shall be sold when practicable, in family-size parcels, no more than one such parcel being sold to any one family or individual, and such sale being made insofar as possible to persons who expect to live upon and cultivate such land. This subsection shall apply only to land acquired after July 1, 1940."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: On page 37, line 22, after the word "properties", insert the words "under this act"; and on page 37, line 24, after the word "properties", insert the words "under this act."

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 39, line 12, add a new subsection as follows:

"(g) In order to promote the orderly disposal of real property a board of classification and assignment is hereby created consisting of one representative of the Department of Agriculture to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, one representative of the Department of the Interior to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, and one representative of the Public Buildings Administration to be appointed by the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency. The Administrator shall refer all real property declared as surplus to this board and such board shall assign such property for disposition to that Government agency which in his opinion is best equipped for the essential disposition of the property in the public interest: *Provided, however,* That land suitable for agriculture or forest development shall be assigned to the Department of Agriculture and lands suitable for graz-

ing or the development of minerals shall be assigned to the Department of the Interior."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this section of the bill. The only section in the bill that relates to a board is section 4 on page 27. This particular section does not relate in any way to anything of that character, nor does it create any additional agency such as is proposed to be created by the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the section to which I seek to add this provision is called General Provisions. "General Provisions" I assume means general provisions.

In the second place there was stricken from this section a subsection (g) which had to do with the disposal of agricultural lands which was originally in the bill reported by the committee. My amendment has to do with the disposition of lands and it seems to me it belongs logically in that section of the bill where there was formerly a section appearing on the very same subject.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am through.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And subsection (g) was stricken for the very reason advanced by the gentleman from New York, that it had no place under "General provisions" and we are limited to the matter stated in subsections (a) and (b).

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood the gentleman from Texas to say it was stricken because it was the desire of the committee to make that not a mandatory provision but to put it under the policy provisions.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly; and it has no place in this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I did not understand him to so state.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is not germane to the pending section and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I call attention to subparagraph (c) on page 38, the second subdivision.

Mr. MANASCO. Line 8?

Mr. TABER. Line 8, reading:

Be accountable for the collection of any purchase price which is determined to be uncollectible by the agency responsible therefor.

Mr. Chairman, that would mean if an agency sold some surplus property and the agency determined the amount was uncollectible, that would be the end of the story and no one else would have any

right to protect the interests of the Government. It seems to me we should not let an agency make a determination of that kind, or one that might be so conclusive.

Mr. MANASCO. Under section 10 (a) on page 31, we authorize the sale of this property on credit, cash, or for other goods.

Mr. TABER. Why should not these things be passed on to the Comptroller General or to the Attorney General to be followed up, instead of letting the agency determine that the account is uncollectible and let them out from all responsibility? It seems to me that part of it should go out.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The purpose of this provision is not to prevent collection at all but to provide that the officer shall not be personally liable for the use of his judgment. It would not prevent the General Accounting Office from discharging its duty under existing law. This subdivision would simply relieve the officer who acts without any fraud and in good faith from personal accountability. It would not relieve the debtor from paying or the Government from collecting.

Mr. MANASCO. If the purchaser were solvent at the time of the determination, the officer would not be liable and the General Accounting Office could still force payment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 38, line 8, strike out lines 8 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me ridiculous to allow an agency to determine that an account is not collectible. It is absolutely unnecessary to have this language if the regular provisions of the law permitting collection of governmental accounts should apply to that sort of thing just like everything else. I do not think we ought to have this provision in the bill which says that no officer or employee of the Government shall be accountable for the collection of any purchase price which is determined to be uncollectible by the agency responsible therefor. It seems to me it is perfectly clear that that language should go out.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Would the gentleman object to amending his amendment by stating on line 7 after the word "fraud" insert a period and striking out beginning with the word "or"?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I will accept that. Insert a period after the word "fraud" in line 7 and striking out beginning with the word "or" in line 7 and lines 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If that language remains in the bill it would seem to me an

agency would be liable for the completion of a contract that it did not make, unless the language is stricken out.

Mr. TABER. Yes. It seems to me that is necessary. I will accept the amendment.

Mr. MANASCO. And in line 6 the figure "(1)" should be stricken also.

Mr. TABER. Yes; the figure "(1)" should also go out in line 6.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That will be included in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 38, strike out all after the word "fraud" in line 7, down to and including the word "therefor" in line 10, and strike out the figure "(1)" in line 6.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 38, line 6, strike out the word "no" in line 6 and insert the word "the" and strike out the words "except for", in line 6 and insert the word "including", and strike out the word "or" in line 7 and insert the words "but shall not", and strike out the figure "(2)" in line 8.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, everything after the word "fraud" in line 7 has been stricken.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, in view of the previous amendment having been agreed to my amendment should be modified and only the first part offered. It would strike out the word "no" in line 6 and insert the word "the", and it would strike out the words "except for" in line 6 and insert the word "including."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: Page 38, line 6, strike out the word "no" in line 6 and insert the word "the", and strike out the words "except for" in line 6 and insert the word "including."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I had proposed to offer an amendment, including the provisions of the one offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I have changed my amendment now inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York has been agreed to. In my opinion, the argument made by the gentleman from New York is proper.

My amendment, however, would go further and would provide that where any property is disposed of in accordance with this act and any regulations prescribed under this act the officer or employee of the Government shall be liable with respect to such disposition, and that would include any fraud on his own part.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. Under existing law such person would be liable for fraud.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. He would be liable for fraud; yes.

Mr. MANASCO. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to make it impossible to get anybody to sell this stuff, because there are going to be some losses.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think not. Any public official should be accountable to the public for his acts. If he acts unwisely, he should be held accountable. Any county official or any State official is held accountable, and his bond not only covers fraud but any other acts he might indulge in.

Mr. MANASCO. If there is a mistake in judgment, under the gentleman's amendment the official would be liable.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. If my amendment is adopted, we would be saying that the public official should be careful in the exercise of his judgment, and he would not likely improperly sell a \$10,000 item for \$10.

Mr. MANASCO. I do not think we would get anybody to operate under this act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. All State and county officials do operate now under that type of bond.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We are all fearful of what is going to happen under this program, and, in my judgment, the amendment is a good one. People should not be relieved of their criminal responsibilities under the law without a strong case being made for their being relieved, and I do not think a case has been made either in the report or in the hearings therefor.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman for her contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO: On page 38, after the period in line 3, insert "In the case of real property the form of the deed or other instrument of transfer shall be approved by the Attorney General."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, we have been trying all day to get the Attorney General into this picture. This simply means that the deed of transfer shall be approved by the Attorney General.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

Sec. 16. (a) All proceeds from any transfer or disposition of property under this act shall

be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except as provided in subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section.

(b) Where the property transferred or disposed of was acquired by the use of funds either not appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury or appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury but by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue or receipts, then upon the request of the interested agency the net proceeds of the disposition or transfer shall be credited to the reimbursable fund or appropriation or paid to the owning agency. As used in this subsection the term "net proceeds of the disposition or transfer" means the proceeds of the disposition or transfer minus all expenses incurred for care and handling, completion of semifabricated property, and disposition or transfer.

(c) To the extent authorized by the Administrator, any Government agency disposing of property under this act (1) may deposit, in a special account with the Treasurer of the United States, such amount of the proceeds of such dispositions as it deems necessary to permit appropriate refunds to purchasers when any disposition is rescinded or does not become final, or payments for breach of any warranty, and (2) may withdraw therefrom amounts so to be refunded or paid, without regard to the origin of the funds withdrawn.

(d) Where a contract or subcontract authorizes the proceeds of any sale of property in the custody of the contractor or subcontractor to be credited to the price or cost of the work covered by such contract or subcontract, the proceeds of any such sale shall be credited in accordance with the contract or subcontract and shall not be subject to subsection (a) of this section.

(e) Where property is transferred or disposed of under this act for any consideration other than legal tender of the United States, the disposal agency shall convert such consideration into legal tender of the United States as rapidly as it deems practicable, and pending such conversion, shall retain, preserve, and manage such consideration, in such manner as it deems appropriate. Where the disposal agency acquires or retains any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security in connection with any transfer or disposition of property under this act, the disposal agency shall retain, preserve, and manage such security and may enforce and settle any right of the Government with respect thereto in such manner and upon such terms as it deems in the best interest of the Government. The Administrator may prescribe regulations to govern the exercise of the authority granted under this subsection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HERTER: On page 39, line 16, strike out the words "as miscellaneous receipts" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "to the credit of a special fund which shall be used exclusively for the reduction of the public debt."

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. Under the bill as written all of the proceeds from the sale of surplus property are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts where they might be used for current expenditures. The purpose of this amendment is to have them covered into a special fund where they can be used only in the reduction of the public debt.

In connection with this the Baruch report made a very strong recommendation, and I would like to read just a few words that appear in that report:

All of the war surpluses will have been paid for by the American public either through war taxes or the increase in the national debt. Therefore, the proceeds of all sales should go to reduce that debt, lowering the post-war carrying charges which will have to be met through taxation. Certainly no agency should be permitted to sell surpluses and use the proceeds for other purposes.

The fact that surplus sales will lower the debt dramatizes an important point which some business groups are inclined to forget. The net result of an effective disposal program will aid all business; which is an important consideration to be balanced against the possible short-term effects of individual sales.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Under the provisions of the bill it would not be possible, would it, for an agency of the Government to spend this money that is covered into the Treasury?

Mr. HERTER. That is quite correct. Unless it is in the Treasury it has to be reappropriated. On the other hand, there is a tremendous temptation, and it would be a temptation that would come to either party, if a large amount of money is realized from the sale of surplus material, to appropriate that as current receipts for current expenditures. I think this is a safeguarding feature which will very definitely help the entire economy and financing of our Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the financial condition of the country was such that this amendment could be carried out, I think it would be a fine thing as it would reduce the public debt. But I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, using the language of our good friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rich, Where are you going to get the money to pay the expenses of the Government unless you tax the people? Remember we are going to pass laws that will cost plenty of money.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we have no idea how long it is going to take to dispose of this surplus property.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true.

Mr. HERTER. I think any prudent financing would indicate that we are going to balance our budget just as soon as the war makes it possible, and this money ought to be used then to reduce the debt. It is a bookkeeping transaction, I will admit.

Mr. COCHRAN. We are required to pay the interest on our national debt, and nobody knows how long we will have to pay that interest. On the basis of the national debt today, the interest is six billion or more a year. You are going to have to collect that \$6,000,000,000 along with additional money for additional expenses. As I have stated before, you are going to have an adjusted compensation or bonus act. On the basis of costing \$4,000,000,000 for World War No. 1, taking into consideration the number of men and women in the service during this war, that is going to amount to between twelve and sixteen billion dollars. You have many other large expenditures facing the Treasury.

Where are you going to get these funds? Two ways—one by taxation, one by issuing bonds.

It seems to me you should not tie this money up in this way. It should go into the Treasury of the United States. The Congress controls the purse, and if the Treasury has the fund, the Congress can pass a law requiring a certain amount of money to apply to the national debt, or to be used for other purposes—only Congress can spend that money. We should not tie this money up in this way, because we cannot foresee what is going to happen. Business is asking for a reduction in taxes. One group wants to reduce corporation taxes away down to almost nothing. Where will the money come from to pay our expenses if we are going to reduce taxes and apply all the surplus money to a reduction of the national debt? I say it would be fine if we could do it, but the Congress would make an awful mistake to tie that money up for that one purpose. I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will prevail. It seems to me that the amendment represents nothing more than common honesty. The national debt of the United States was enhanced to acquire these properties, and the national debt of the United States should be diminished by the amount of the proceeds realized by the sale of these properties.

If the United States of America were a business corporation, the lien of any corporate mortgage would attach to these properties, and when the properties were sold the proceeds would be held necessarily for the reduction of the mortgage.

I am not at all troubled by the point the gentleman from Missouri makes. If we are not in a position to balance the national budget—and goodness knows the national budget ought to be balanced at the earliest possible moment—we had better do what we do now and borrow money, rather than to kid ourselves into believing that the proceeds from the sale of these capital assets represent income of the United States. That is bad book-keeping, it is bad philosophy, and it is bad government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to get the gentleman's reaction to the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. It seems to me that if this Congress exercises any sanity whatsoever it will legislate in a direction which will keep the 51,000,000 payrollees on the pay rolls, earning a national income in the neighborhood of \$130,000,000,000 per annum, with a great reduction in tax rates levied against that income, and with a consequent reduction in Government outgo, and in that manner raise from \$25,000,000,000 to \$35,000,000,000 per annum through Federal taxes instead of \$48,000,000,000 as at the present time, and use at least \$5,000,000,000 of that for the purpose of reducing the Gov-

ernment debt. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that that is the source from which we will get the dollars. I join with the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Massachusetts in supporting this amendment. In my opinion it would be one of the greatest psychological powers the Administrator could possibly use in disposing of this surplus to the people, in saying to them that the proceeds will go to reduce the Federal debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk read as follows:

USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

SEC. 17. (a) Any Government agency is authorized to use for the disposition of property under this act, and for its care and handling, and for the completion of semi-fabricated property, pending such disposition, any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated, allocated, or available to it for the purpose of production or procurement of such property.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate for administering the provisions of this act.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 18. (a) The Administrator may delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him by this act to any Deputy Administrator or Assistant Administrator, and may delegate such authority and discretion, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to the head of any Government agency to the extent necessary to the handling and solution of problems peculiar to that agency.

(b) The head of any Government agency may delegate, and authorize successive re-delegations of, any authority and discretion conferred upon him or his agency by or pursuant to this act to any officer, agent, or employee of such agency or, with the approval of the Administrator, to any other Government agency.

(c) Any two or more Government agencies may exercise jointly any authority and discretion conferred upon each of them individually by or pursuant to this act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 42, line 15, after the period insert a new subsection as follows:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, all authority and discretion herein conferred upon the Administrator shall with respect to agricultural commodities and food located in the United States, its territories, and possessions, be vested in and exercised solely by the War Food Administrator."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides that all authority in the disposition of surplus food shall be vested in the War Food Administrator. This is the place where this rightfully belongs. On February 29 of this year I introduced the bill H. R. 4281, not especially as a result of my own thinking but as a result of the thinking of all of the private agencies, business firms, and associations dealing with the disposition of surplus foods. H. R. 4281 had the unanimous, wholehearted endorsement of representatives of 44 types of groups interested in disposition of surplus foods. It had the endorsement of

the wholesale food brokers, the retail food brokers, independents, chain-store organizations, the farm bureaus, the granges, the Farmers' Union, labor, and the consumer groups. In fact, it had the endorsement of practically every group dealing with the disposition of foods.

All through these hearings it is contemplated that the War Food Administrator shall have charge of the disposition of the surplus foods, but I wish to call your attention to the fact that unless the War Food Administrator does have charge of this disposition, he will have a difficult time in administering the program for support prices. How can the War Food Administrator support these prices unless he knows how much he can dispose of, what his inventories are, what foods he has now, and what is forthcoming in the future?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sure the gentleman's amendment is well taken. I think it is perfectly evident that if the War Food Administrator does not have this whole job, he cannot live up to the commitments that have been made with regard to support prices nor can the best use of this food be made. Further, I hope we are going to write into the bill the intention of Congress, because after what happened to land and after the way land was given over to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of being handled in the agencies where it should have been handled, I do not know what will happen to food unless we specifically and mandatorily place it where it is supposed to go.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. A great deal of this food is abroad. We investigated the matter and found that the War Food Administrator has no representatives abroad. They are in this country.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. My amendment applies to food located in the United States and in its Territories and possessions, and not in other countries.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But this bill contemplates one agency to dispose of that food generally.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The agency we are creating here cannot support the prices of farm commodities. What you and I need to fear is the fall in farm prices in the future. If these agricultural products are dumped on the market, it will injure not only the farmer but every laboring man in the country, it will drive every little cross roads merchant off the cross roads, and will destroy the economy of the entire country.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. There is a provision in the bill already that we hope will prevent the dumping of any kind of a

commodity that might have a bad effect on our domestic economy.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No one knows better how to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities than the War Food Administrator, who is responsible for the production program.

Mr. MANASCO. The War Food Administration was created by Executive order, and that office may be abolished tomorrow.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes; but this committee did not think so because in several instances in this bill it mentions the War Food Administrator. In fact, the committee made him a member of the board.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

APPLICABILITY

Sec. 19. All policies and procedures relating to surplus property prescribed by the Surplus War Property Administration, created by Executive Order No. 9425, dated February 19, 1944, or any other Government agency, in effect upon the effective date of this act, and not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by regulations of the Administrator or of the agency in accordance with this act.

Sec. 20. (a) Nothing in this act shall limit or affect the authority of commanders in active theaters of military operations to dispose of property in their control.

(b) The provisions of this act shall be applicable to dispositions of property within the United States and elsewhere, but the Administrator may exempt from some or all of the provisions hereof, dispositions of property located outside of the continental United States or in Alaska, whenever he deems that such provisions would obstruct the efficient and economic disposition of such property in accordance with the objectives of this act.

Sec. 21. (a) The authority conferred by this act is in addition to any authority conferred by any other law and shall not be subject to the provisions of any law inconsistent herewith. This act shall not impair or affect any authority for the disposition of property under any other law, except that the Administrator may prescribe regulations to govern any disposition of surplus property under any such authority to the same extent as if the disposition were made under this act, whenever he deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

(b) Nothing in this act shall impair or affect the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; or the act of October 2, 1942 (ch. 578, 56 Stat. 765), as amended; or of section 301 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942; or of the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 31), as amended; or acts supplemental thereto, or of any law regulating the exportation of property from the United States.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS of Ohio: On page 44, line 5, strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following: "or of any criminal law of the United States."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is a remarkable bill in that although it sets up a vast, new administration with broad powers and responsi-

bilities, we find no criminal section therein, no section with respect to penalties of any kind. I presume this would be because it was intended that the penal laws now in effect as to the disposal of Government property should continue in effect. If there is any question about that, it should be made clear by this amendment which I have suggested, which will provide that nothing in this act shall impair or affect the provisions of the criminal laws of the United States. There are, throughout this bill, some broad phrases which might be held to prevent the application of the criminal laws. Then, in section 21, with which we are dealing, there is a provision that nothing in this act shall impair the provisions of certain acts. This would imply that acts not mentioned are impaired or affected by this new law. It seems to me it would be wise, since we have provided no specific penal section, to show that we all intend that those who deal with this property on behalf of Government agencies and those of our citizens who deal with the Government agencies shall be keenly aware that there is a possibility of criminal prosecution, not only for fraud, bribery, and extortion but for the many other crimes which are set forth in the Criminal Code. We want to make it clear that this whole administration is subject to our penal laws. We do not want to put dealers in surplus property beyond the reach of our criminal laws. We bring them in by this amendment.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. I think the gentleman's amendment is a good one. I would like to say I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment which will include a criminal penalty for the violation of this act. But I think, nevertheless, the gentleman's amendment is a good one.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The amendment which I have offered would probably not be in conflict with the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. What assurance can the gentleman give the House that we have no law on the statute books today which might prohibit the sale of some of the articles that are declared surplus and make it a criminal offense if they did sell them? In other words, assume we have a law on the statute books which would prohibit the sale of shoes, it would be a criminal offense to sell them. And the man that sells shoes under this act would be subject to the criminal law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, who is a member of the committee sponsoring this bill, if there is any such law, let us have the committee point it out. I am saying to you that I am assuming the committee did not intend to invalidate or nullify any criminal laws. If the gentleman is saying to me and to the Committee of the Whole that there are various criminal laws which are intended to be repealed or impaired by the law, then there

is even more necessity for the amendment which I have just offered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; the gentleman does not want to put that language in my mouth. I did not say that by any means.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I simply turned the gentleman's question right back to him.

Mr. COCHRAN. The fact that we do not set aside the criminal laws seems to me to make the amendment unnecessary.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the gentleman has any doubt that there may be criminal laws which are superseded or impaired by the general provisions of this act, then this amendment is necessary, and if there are any criminal laws that are going to be repealed by the operation of this act, we had better have them specifically before us and see whether we want to repeal them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 40, noes 36.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY: On page 44, line 5, after the words "United States", insert the following: "Or so much of the Military Appropriation Act, 1945, as is contained in the last two provisos of the second paragraph under the heading 'Corps of Engineers'."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment follow immediately after the Vorys amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. The purpose of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is to preserve in this bill a provision which was added to the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945. That bill was adopted during the month of June of this year. On yesterday the Committee agreed to the amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which he said he felt would provide for this provision along with others. I am doubtful as to that because the language of the appropriation bill is in direct opposition to the language of this bill and as a matter of caution it should be adopted. That language is as follows:

Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of War shall not be authorized to sell any military post or reservation, nor part thereof, acquired or owned by the United States prior to July 2, 1940, nor shall he declare any such military post, or reservation, nor any part thereof, surplus for disposition by any other officer, board, or commission: *Provided further*, That this prohibition shall not apply to nor prevent the transfer of real estate or other property to the Veterans' Administration for the care and treatment of veterans or to the Navy Department.

I am sure many of you were very much surprised, as I was, to find this bill, which we had looked to as being a bill for the demobilization of the Nation, is not such a bill in fact.

When you come to the definition of "property" in this bill we find it is more inclusive than any of us could have thought of. It is:

The term "property" means any interest, owned by the United States or any Government agency, in real or personal property, of any kind, wherever located.

The mobilization of the United States began with the approval on July 2, 1940, of the act under which we gave the Army and the Navy the right to establish military locations and plants without specific authority of the Congress. It has never been the policy of this Government to permit the Army or the Navy to dispose of any military reservation or post without specific authority of the Congress. If we do not maintain this control then the military policy of the United States has passed from the hands of the Congress of the United States into the hands of the Army, the very thing we have condemned in all militaristic states—that the military policy of the Nation was determined by military men.

This amendment was agreed to practically unanimously in June, at the time the military appropriation bill was considered. It had to be unanimous because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. It was carried forward yesterday in the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. As I say, it is contrary to the provisions of this bill, and I am afraid that this bill being later in point of time, it would control.

This bill is much broader than it has been discussed as being. Unless some provision of this kind is placed in the bill you will never again within the next 25 or 50 years have the Military Establishment, the Navy, the Veterans' Administration, or any of the others come before the Congress for anything but the salaries of their employees, because under its provision, by the simple expediency of declaring the stations which they do not want to retain "surplus" they retain the ones they want to retain, and thereby they establish their own military policy with reference to size, location, and disposition of the Army and the Navy.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. As minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs I want to say that I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and I hope it is unanimously adopted.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Would your amendment also refer to airports?

Mr. KILDAY. It would not specifically, unless they were within the control of the Army. This bill defines the term "owning agency" in the case of any property, as meaning the Government

agency having control of such property otherwise than solely as disposal agent. Therefore, if the Army has control of it, it would apply in the event it was owned by the Government prior to the 2d of July 1940, when the expansion program began.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. I have in mind an airport which cost \$6,500,000, taking in many thousand acres of land. It has now been designated as "a stand-by field," still in control of the Air Corps of the Army. The land is being leased for food production, but the runways, and so forth, are idle. Would your amendment cover that?

Mr. KILDAY. It would depend upon when the airport was acquired. If it were acquired after mobilization began on the 2d day of July 1940, then it would be subject to be declared surplus. If owned by the Government prior to that time, if it were one of these old military reservations and posts which constituted the United States Army at the time of the declaration of war, and over which the Army could not even grant a right-of-way for a sewer or an electric line, then they would not be able to dispose of it.

I say to you we are going far enough in this bill without losing control of our military policy. Under this very bill the Capitol in which we sit, if declared surplus, could be sold without legislative authority. The White House, if declared surplus—and some of the gentlemen on my left might think that would be all right—could be sold without legislative authority, should the executive branch of the Government declare the same to be surplus. I realize many administrative departments would like to declare this building and all of us sitting here surplus as they have done by Executive order on many occasions.

Rather than being a simple bill for the disposal of surplus war property or a demobilization bill, this bill constitutes, in fact, an authorization for the reorganization of all of the Government departments in accordance with their own desires. Every department of the Government can dispose of any property held by it, even though it be of many years' standing and has no reference to the prosecution of the war. National parks, oil reserves, and every other kind of property can be sold without any interference by Congress as to price, terms, or vendee, if the owning agency of the Government declares the same to be surplus.

The foreign policy of the Nation is in the hands of the owning agency and the Surplus Property Administrator. An air base in any foreign nation being under the control of the Army, it is the owning agency. If the Army should declare the same surplus it is subject to be sold by the Administrator without reference to the State Department.

There is an urgent necessity for a law to permit the disposition of perishable goods, machines, machine tools, automotive equipment, and other items which deteriorate rapidly. There is no necessity for the immediate sale of real estate. Surely all of the real estate now owned by the Government should not be placed upon the market and returned to production within the 3-year limitation of this bill. We are at our maximum production without this land and the demand for agricultural products will decrease with the end of the war. If all of these thousands of acres are returned to production, we face the necessity of paying farm benefits to limit the production upon this very land.

This bill confers sweeping and unlimited powers upon an administrative agency. These powers go much further than Congress should ever permit. A reasonable approach to this problem would suggest that it be divided into three bills. One to dispose of perishable and deteriorating items quickly; one, to formulate a policy for the use, retention, and disposition of war plants, and a third to provide for the disposition of lands. The bill is fraught with much danger. I shall vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EFFECTIVE DATE; EXPIRATION

SEC. 22. This act shall become effective from the date of its enactment. Unless extended by law, this act shall expire at the end of 3 years following the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday an amendment offered by me providing that authorization by Congress should be given before any naval vessels, establishments, stations or facilities were sold, leased, or exchanged, was adopted. The amendment carried a second proviso, which was quite independent from the first, that the Navy Department should be the sole disposal agency for all naval property.

I had a conference today with representatives of the Navy Department regarding this second proviso. The Navy, as you know, as well as members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House are in accord with the first proviso of this amendment. The reasons why this provision is necessary to the preservation and security of our Navy were fully explained to the House in the debate on yesterday. However, the Navy representatives expressed the opinion to me and some of my colleagues this morning, that they would not like to assume the duty of taking care of the sales of various property of the Navy, aside from combat vessels, stations, and establishments. So I told the representatives and my colleagues that I would ask unanimous consent today to return to section 10, for the

purpose of amending the second proviso of the amendment.

The second proviso of the amendment, which has nothing to do with the first proviso, reads that the Navy Department shall be sole disposal agency for all naval property. I would amend this second proviso by striking out the last three words "all naval property" and inserting in lieu thereof "naval vessels, stations, and establishments." So that the Navy would be the disposal agency for naval vessels, stations, and establishments only. The first proviso of the amendment requiring that the consent of Congress must be obtained in order to sell, lease, transfer, or otherwise dispose of vessels or stations or establishments would stand as it is.

As I stated yesterday, I think a great majority of you agree that an amendment of this kind requiring the consent of Congress for the disposal of any combat naval vessel, station, or establishment, is absolutely necessary to the preservation of our Navy. Ask any man who has studied naval policies and trends throughout the world and he will give it to you as his opinion that when this war is concluded one of the desires of foreign nations to whom we have lease-loaned ships will be to keep those ships if they can. That is what they desire, and all of us on the Naval Affairs Committee know it. Under this bill, if we do not retain this amendment so as to vest the power of disposal in the Congress, all that it would be necessary to do in order to sell or give these ships to foreign nations would be to declare those vessels which we had lease-loaned to be surplus. Then the executive agency empowered by this bill to do so could transfer them or sell them to those foreign governments without the consent of Congress.

At the conclusion of my remarks I am going to ask unanimous consent to return to section 10 for the purpose of offering the perfecting amendments to which I have just referred. If unanimous consent is not granted and the bill is passed without the perfecting amendments, I have stated to the Department and to my colleagues that I will ask the conference committee to make them when the bill goes to conference. I should, of course, prefer to make them here. In my opinion the perfecting amendments are of no great importance, but, as stated by the Navy Department's representative, they will be of considerable convenience to the Department. They will in no way affect the first proviso of my amendment, which was adopted yesterday and which retains full control by the Congress of the disposal of ships, stations, and establishments.

If the House will give its unanimous consent to return to section 10 now, I shall offer the perfecting amendments; or I will be glad to accept a substitute offered by anyone else incorporating them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to return to section 10, to which he offered an amendment yesterday, for the purpose of modifying the amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the provision which provides that no naval property shall be declared surplus or disposed of unless declared surplus by the Secretary of the Navy was approved, and this bill was approved by the Secretary of the Navy, and his report is in the hearings of the committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. With all due deference to the gentleman, I believe, in the interest of good fellowship, in the handling of this bill, the gentleman from Mississippi should not object to returning to this section. Why not let the amendment be offered as the gentleman from Oregon desires in order to perfect his original amendment? I believe it would help the passage of this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that during the hearings I was in doubt about this matter, and I asked that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House be invited to come before us to testify. I asked several times. I was indulgent at all times during our speedy hearings. I wanted to save time. Now the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, on which committee I had the honor of serving for 6 years, are entitled to this consideration here on the floor. I think the gentleman from Mississippi should permit the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Mott] to perfect his amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answer that observation by saying that this bill provides that no property under the Navy Department can be disposed of unless it is declared surplus by the Navy Department and not by the President of the United States or by any other person. Furthermore, I believe that under the gentleman's own admission, if there are any facilities, if there are any establishments, including airfields, airplane factories, not needed by the Navy, and declared surplus by the Navy, under the Mott amendment, they could not be disposed of except by act of Congress. There are several defects in the amendment, and the request referred to any one of them. All defects should be corrected in the request. If the request is confined to combat vessels and stations, it would perfect his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, briefly, this is a very important matter. It is now recognized that a mistake was made on yesterday when this amendment was adopted.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman said it was agreed. Nobody agrees to that; at least I do not want to be put in the class of agreeing to it.

Mr. COLMER. Very well; then for what purpose did the gentleman desire to amend his amendment?

Mr. MOTT. I want to offer a perfecting amendment to the second proviso.

Mr. COLMER. I understand.

Mr. MOTT. Nobody objects to the first proviso; it was passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. COLMER. Then the gentleman admits that he was wrong when he put the second proviso in.

Mr. MOTT. Now the gentleman is putting words into my mouth. He must not say that.

Mr. COLMER. Very well; I do not want to get technical.

Mr. MOTT. I was making a concession by offering this perfecting amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry; I decline to yield further, because the time is limited, and the matter is important.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said here about what the Navy wanted and what the Navy did not want. I am authorized to say to you as a result of a conversation I have had with the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bard, that the Navy is satisfied with the provisions relating to this subject as contained in the bill without any amendments. That ought to be clear, that the Navy would prefer the language of the bill. I know, of course, what is back of this. Back of this is the apprehension of somebody that the ships of the Navy will be sold to some other Government or that we are going to sell them for salvage or something of that sort; but it must be remembered that under the provisions of the bill not a single item of the Navy's property can be declared surplus except by the Navy, and, therefore, the Director under this bill would have nothing whatever to do with it; he could not sell one item of it unless it was first declared surplus by the Navy. So why all this hullabaloo about this matter?

Let me say further that if this amendment remains in the bill someone should ask unanimous consent to return and offer another amendment to do the same thing for the Army; then you would have all of it out and could just pass the bill and go home and there would not be any necessity for any Administrator or anybody else. What I am trying to say to you is that by this amendment you take out from under the provisions of the bill one-quarter, one-third, one-half, or whatever proportion it is, of the surplus property of which we are trying to dispose, whatever proportion the Navy has compared to the Army. This amendment ought to be stricken out, and when we get back into the House a separate vote will be asked on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment by the Committee yesterday gave me some concern and since that time I have had opportunity to give some study to the question, and also to take advantage of the hearing which the Committee on Post-War Military Policy held

this morning in asking an Army witness, General Clay, what would be the reaction of the War Department if the House upon yesterday or upon any day advocated an amendment to this pending bill to the effect that the War Department should be the sole selling agent of any of its property. The response was instant and to the effect that the War Department would tremendously regret if it were saddled with the terrific job of selling at wholesale or retail the surplus property in its hands; they would infinitely prefer that such property when declared surplus should be sold by some civilian agency of the Government. They would dread establishing an enormous selling agency within the personnel of the War Department in the Army; and I could not help suspecting that the Navy Department would have the same reaction.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. For a question only.

Mr. COCHRAN. Just for a brief observation, two lines?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. When the joint hearings were held General Clay told the committee that the War Department was not in position to handle any surplus property while it was fighting the war, and under no consideration did they want to handle it after the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman's contribution confirms what I heard General Clay say this morning. To that extent I believe we can all admit that the second provision of the amendment which was adopted on yesterday was a mistake. It was unfortunate it was done.

This discussion may all be surplusage as objection has been made to the request for unanimous consent to return to the amendment.

Another portion of the amendment has concerned me somewhat but upon this I hasten to admit I cannot speak with authority or based upon experience. The first part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon reads to the effect that no vessel, stations, establishments, or facilities of the Navy shall be declared surplus and disposed of without the consent of Congress. Obviously the objective the gentleman from Oregon had in mind was to prevent the disposal of what we know as the naval combat or important supply vessels. I visualize however the Navy as today containing hundreds of little boats or craft which might be called vessels and which probably will be sold. For the Navy to be compelled to come to the Congress every time it wanted to sell a group of yachts that have been taken over to meet this emergency, or very small patrol boats, launches, motor-driven, would place upon the Navy a tremendous task and upon the Naval Affairs Committee of the House an almost impossible task.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. For the gentleman's information I may say that only about 3 months ago the Naval Affairs Committee reported a bill authorizing the Navy to

dispose of vessels up to a certain tonnage. The Congress passed that law and it is now the law of the land. If the Navy wants to dispose of further vessels of that class it may do so without any further act of Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It may not do so if the gentleman's amendment is adopted.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman should read the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It says "vessels" and it takes the place of any previous law.

Mr. MOTT. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. It says these shall not be sold or disposed of except under existing law. In cases where there is no law on the subject, the sale must be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is a question of construction. The way I read it the effect of this is new law and it supercedes any previous law from this point on, and if the amendment should prevail, the Navy could not sell any vessels without the consent of the Congress.

I can well understand the concern of some of the gentlemen on the Naval Affairs Committee that the Congress should interpose against the sale or surrender or sinking of any vessels of real value to the national defense. I had hoped if this thing were to be taken up in conference or on the floor of the House by unanimous consent, a limit in tonnage might be agreed on with respect to disposition of vessels in order to allow the Navy to get rid of vessels up to three or four hundred tons displacement without the consent of Congress. Of course, larger vessels should have the consent of the Congress.

Another thing that disturbed me about the amendment was the use of the word "facility." That word "facility" might cover almost anything. It might cover a machine in a navy yard gun shop. It could not be sold then without the consent of the Congress. It might include, and I am not sure about this, radio receiving and sending stations which could not be sold without the consent of the Congress. I do not think we should get into this as deeply as that.

I had hoped that we might make no special provisions with respect to the Navy service but that it should be confined to vessels of certain types and sizes and to shore establishments.

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. The Mott amendment provides that no naval vessel shall be disposed of except in accordance with the provisions of specific law. We have authorized it by special law which came from the Naval Affairs Committee. It would seem to me that the Naval Affairs Committee of the House is more conversant with these matters and we ought to be able to deal with them better.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I may be mistaken, but my interpretation of it is different, but I do direct your special attention to the use of that word "facility."

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman another question? Agreeing with everything the gentleman has said for the

sake of argument, is it not the gentleman's opinion, even though he might have some objection to certain provisions of the amendment, that it should be retained in the bill in order that we may have something to go on in the way of direction to the Navy when we get into conference between the House and Senate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The amendment is so extreme in its second provision that I do not see how the House can accept it. I had hoped, though, that this thing could be settled in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Would not the gentleman favor going back by unanimous consent at this time—because this is one of the most important amendments to the bill—and attempting to perfect it in the House without going to a motion to recommit; otherwise we will retain the whole provision and go to conference on that? Would not the gentleman think that would be the orderly procedure?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely agreeable to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, it was the purpose and the intent of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House in limiting the sale of naval vessels at the time we did to combat vessels. In other words, we did not want any Secretary of the Navy or any committee, such as the surplus property advisory committee to be able to take a combat vessel and dispose of it in any way without the consent of the Congress. I wonder if the gentleman would not be agreeable, when we go back to the amendment, to limit this to what we in the Naval Affairs Committee term "combat vessels." The word "facility" means shore establishments.

Mr. WADSWORTH. You mention shore establishments, then you use "facility" in addition.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We wanted no more scrapping of the Navy. We wanted no battleship or no combat ship to ever be disposed of in any manner by anyone except with the consent of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am in agreement with the gentleman that we should not permit the disposal of combat vessels, but if you are going to use the word "combat" it is pretty restrictive. How about hospital ships? How about the great supply of tankers for the Navy, and supply ships? Does the present law forbid the disposal of combat ships?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We used the word "vessels." It was understood all the time that they would only consult us on combat ships. Of course, we have over 7,000 ships in the Navy. The great bulk of

the ships are auxiliaries, but the auxiliary strength of the Navy is always determined in ratio to the number of combat ships, so that would take care of the difference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman sure?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it would.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. I would like to have the gentleman explain to the House whether or not this amendment or any provision in the bill, as he understands it, applies to vessels now in foreign countries under lend-lease?

Mr. WADSWORTH. My recollection is that the vessels now in possession of foreign countries under the lend-lease program are still the property of the United States.

Mr. CLASON. And under the control of the Navy Department they would come under some other provisions of the bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If they are naval vessels, they are under the Navy Department. If they are merchant vessels, they are under the Maritime Commission, and so on.

Mr. CLASON. Even though they are subject to the lend-lease provisions, they remain under the Navy, if they are Navy vessels?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have lent their use only. We have never lost title to the ships.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to something that seems to me has not been noted. The amendment of the gentleman from Oregon says:

Provided, That no naval vessels, station, establishment, or facility shall be sold, exchanged, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with the provisions of existing law specifically authorizing the same.

The only thing I can find at the present time in existing law is the following:

Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, no military or naval weapon, ship, boat, aircraft, munitions, supplies, or equipment to which the United States has title in whole or in part, or which has been contracted for, shall hereafter be transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of, in any manner whatsoever, unless the Chief of Naval Operations in the case of naval matériel and the Chief of Staff of the Army in the case of military matériel shall first certify that such matériel is not essential to the defense of the United States.

In the next section of this act it says that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are requested to furnish to the chairmen of the Committees on Naval Affairs and Military Affairs a copy of these contracts that they have, and further puts a limitation in which it says that nothing shall be done with reference to any contract where the original cost of such military or naval equipment, munitions, or supplies did not exceed \$2,000. It is in the hands of the Department unless it is more than that, at which time they must bring it up here.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. Let me go on for a few moments.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon seems to me not to change this existing law. I should say this is the existing law to which his amendment applies. If that be the case, then the whole amendment is unnecessary and we could strike it all out.

Provided further, That the Navy Department shall be the sole disposal agency for all naval property.

I think that is wrong. I am glad the gentleman from Oregon wishes to strike it out and perfect it. I see no objection to that. I think he has perfected it when he puts in the words "all naval vessels." Nevertheless I think the whole discussion, as the gentleman from New York said, is surplusage.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREWRY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. May I call the gentleman's attention to the further language of the first proviso which he did not read? I agree, of course, with the gentleman's interpretation of existing law. The amendment provides that it shall be sold only under the provisions of existing law, and then it goes on to say:

And in all cases where such transactions have not been so specifically authorized, then no sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition of any naval vessel, station, establishment, or facility shall be made unless the Congress by law shall authorize it.

That simply means that the vessels shall be sold under the provisions of existing law, where there is law on the subject, and indicates that where there is no law governing it, then they shall not be sold until the Congress shall by law authorize it. I see no objection to that idea, but I think the whole matter had better be stricken out, and then the existing law would be in full force and effect.

Mr. MOTT. The existing law, in my opinion, would not cover all of it by any means.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all that we are asking is an opportunity to perfect this amendment. I am of the opinion that the second proviso of the Mott amendment is not necessary nor really desirable in its entirety, at least. It would have the effect of setting the Navy up in the business of disposing of clothing, food, and miscellaneous items that are common to all of the agencies that will have surpluses. Such common items ought to be handled by one agency and competitively by several different Government agencies. But the first section, it seems to me, is a matter of vital importance and basic concern to the Congress. We must never again—and how many times have we heard this in the last year or two in this House?—permit the destruction of our Navy, or the reducing of it beyond the danger point. That is what our Committee on Naval Affairs, which has worked so hard for so many years to build up the Navy, wants to see assured by the House. It is merely that

the composition of the American Navy shall always be in the hands of the Congress itself. No State Department agents, no diplomats, no executive official should ever be able to change by executive decree the congressional intent in regard to the size of our Navy. This strikes directly to the question of the size of our Navy, which is and ought to be authorized by the Congress, and no change should be permitted without the knowledge and authority of the Congress. That is all we are asking for in the first section of the Mott amendment.

We are now asking consent to go back and strike out the second section of the Mott amendment, which would leave the disposal of ordinary items in the central disposal agency, but naval vessels and naval shore establishments are in a different category from any other type of property that can be surplusaged. There is nothing comparable to Navy vessels and naval shore establishments, and they should be dealt with separately. Certainly the Congress should be apprised of the fact and should have to give its consent if the Navy, which has been authorized by the Congress, is to be reduced. Congress must have that information and knowledge and must give its consent, or we have lost the most important element in foreign policy, and that is the size of our Navy and naval establishments.

If the gentlemen on the right-hand side of the aisle will permit us by unanimous consent to return to that amendment, we will move to strike out the second proviso of the Mott amendment and leave in the proviso which says that before any Navy vessel or naval shore establishment shall be disposed of, that information must be reported to the Congress and such disposal must receive its approval. That is a reasonable, logical, sensible thing, and we ought not to divest ourselves of that responsibility. If that is not done, we will either have to have a fight and perhaps a roll call, and if the Mott amendment is retained in the bill we will have to try to work it out in conference and take care of it by way of compromise, or it will have to be stricken out entirely. If that is the case, I think we are assuming a responsibility in delegating our constitutional obligation of providing for the Navy of the United States and are setting a very dangerous precedent. We went through that 25 years ago. Let us not do it again.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On what authority did the President give battleships to foreign countries?

Mr. MAAS. Under the authority of lend-lease. I am very apprehensive, may I say to the gentlewoman, that unless we pass the first proviso of the Mott amendment, not a single naval vessel that has been lend-leased to any foreign government will ever be returned to the United States. They will all be declared surplus and sold for a dollar apiece, perhaps. I think we had better put the control of the size of our Navy in the hands of the Congress, where it was intended to be.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Several destroyers were also turned over.

Mr. MAAS. Those were given before we had any check on it, and were given in exchange, presumably for American bases in British possessions in our hemisphere.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. If we are not allowed by unanimous consent to go back and perfect this second proviso, and we are obliged to vote on the bill containing the amendment as written, if this amendment should be stricken out on a separate vote, is it not a fact that we would have nothing to work on in the Senate and nothing in the House?

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman is correct; then the matter is entirely out of the hands of the Congress and we have lost control of the size of our Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHAFER. What is the parliamentary situation at present?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has risen in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. What is at stake after this is all done? There has been an objection to the request to return to this amendment. What will be the result of all this argument?

Mr. MAAS. We hope to renew that request.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. TABER. May I point out that there is a way around this without returning to section 10 of the bill at this time, and that is by adopting the Mott amendment on a roll-call vote, if we have to, and following that with a motion to recommit which would correct that second part of the amendment. There is a parliamentary way out of it. Under those circumstances it would seem to me that it would be much better and fairer if the members of the committee in charge of the bill would permit us at this time to return to section 10.

I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota would not make that request again, with that picture in front of us, so that we may know how to proceed and accomplish that result.

Mr. MAAS. I thank the gentleman. I will make the request when I have concluded, because I think it would be the more expeditious and the more clear-cut way of doing it.

As the gentleman from New York pointed out, we could do it by retaining the Mott amendment, and then on a motion to recommit perfect it. But you cannot debate that. I hope that there

will be no objection to my request to return to section 10 and then, with full knowledge and proper discussion, perfect this amendment. I think it is very vital that the Congress retain a closer check and control over the composition of the American Navy. There is no instrument of foreign policy that even approaches the potency of our Navy. We must never surrender that by treaty or any other kind of agreement without the knowledge and consent of the Congress itself.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would the gentleman be willing and would the author of the amendment be willing to confine the amendment to naval vessels and shore establishments, and eliminate the word "facility"?

Mr. MAAS. As far as I am concerned, I certainly would, because what we are after, of course, is the question of naval bases and naval vessels. The word "facility" was used because we called a great many naval air stations naval air facilities for convenience. We have naval air facilities that are bigger than all naval air stations in World War No. 1 put together. They are called air facilities to distinguish them from the main station, which is called a naval air station. I am perfectly willing to do that, because "shore establishment" would cover what the gentleman from Oregon and I have in mind.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that the word "facility" has a rather definite meaning in the Navy, and they know that a facility is not a can of beans or anything like that. The Naval Aircraft Factory at Philadelphia is a facility.

Mr. MAAS. That is correct, but if the gentleman would agree to this amendment, "shore establishment" covers all of it, if we could perfect it to say "naval vessels and shore establishments."

Mr. MOTT. That would be perfectly satisfactory to me, because in most cases the facility and station are synonymous.

Mr. MAAS. I know that high officials in the Navy who are dealing with these problems are not opposed to the first proviso of Mr. Mott's amendment. They agree with us, that the Navy is in a far sounder position in having the Congress in partnership with them in the matter of these major disposals where national and congressional policy are involved, such as the disposition of naval vessels and naval bases.

The Navy will avoid future criticism and the possibility of scandal if the Congress itself approves of its major disposals.

On the larger side of the question, we must not permit any peace conference delegation, nor any President, to use our Naval Establishment as part of the bargaining in international settlements without the full knowledge and consent of the Congress. Certainly no one must be permitted to trade any of our com-

batant vessels, nor surrender any of our hard-won naval bases, for any consideration without the consent of the American people through their Congress.

Let us perfect, but by all means, let us retain the Mott amendment.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 10 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was before the Committee of the Whole there was a discussion and opposition on the part of the committee. It was emphasized that under the terms of this amendment the language "no facility or establishment" would prevent the disposal of any of the surplus properties and plants in many parts of the country. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] mentioned one of the best illustrations that was submitted to our committee. It was said that before a single one of the yachts could be disposed of that were acquired when individuals came trooping to the Navy Department to offer them to the Navy, a special act of Congress would have to be passed under the Mott amendment. He does not propose to correct the objectionable provisions of his amendment. I opposed his amendment when proposed, and I oppose it now.

Nor is that all, Mr. Chairman. When this amendment was pending, after this committee had modified section 7 of the original bill to provide that neither the Army nor the Navy should have any of its property disposed of unless the Army and unless the Navy declared that property to be surplus, the chairman of this committee, in order to make certain and definite that no combat vessel would be disposed of, in order to make certain that the House stood, as I stand, for a big Navy, and in order to make certain that not a vessel of any type that was needed in the big Navy would be disposed of, offered a substitute for the Mott amendment, and that substitute provided that, and I quote:

No vessel under the control of the Department of the Navy shall, unless the Secretary of the Navy has found such vessel not to be a combat ship or a naval auxiliary, or has found it to be based on commercial design or susceptible of commercial usage, be disposed of under this act until the expiration of 30 days after notice of the proposed disposal of the vessel has been sent to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The substitute was rejected, and the Mott amendment, now admitted to be objectionable, was adopted.

In a word, Mr. Chairman, your committee, before it reported this bill, was advised that the great surpluses that were to be disposed of, were not the surpluses that would cripple the Army and were not the surpluses that would cripple the Navy, but were the surpluses that the Army and the Navy would declare to be surpluses. This simple request to go back and remove one objectionable feature does not go to the heart or other

objectionable provisions of the amendment. It leaves the facilities and establishments in the amendment. These words are also objectionable. The amendment should be fully perfected or voted down in the House.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object to the request.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: On page 44, line 11, after "or", insert "at an earlier date if such date be designated."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment is to make this act terminable upon the passing of a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress specifying a time determined by them for its termination, shorter than that now fixed by the provisions of the bill. It is constitutional and is in line with sound governmental policy in connection with this sort of legislation. This is emergency legislation, extraordinary legislation. The Congress is retaining certain supervisory powers with reference to the disposition of these billions of dollars' worth of public property, but of necessity there is a delegation of tremendous power to the executive agencies of the Government. It is close akin to the war powers which the Congress has been granting.

In the long history of Anglo-Saxon governments peoples have granted these emergency powers to deal with emergency situations. By that procedure they have been able affectively to fight their wars, by giving to their government the necessary strength and rapidity of motion. At the same time, by retaining the power to control the exercise of these extraordinary powers and to terminate them, they have been able to avoid long periods of dictatorship. It is one of the most interesting phenomena to be observed in the examination of the behavior of the people, who constitute a democracy. They seem instinctively to sense the existence of a crisis, requiring this increase of the power of government and making its machinery susceptible of a rapidity of motion which their institutions, functioning normally, cannot provide.

Speaking generally they have had the genius while doing this to retain—and we should retain in our agency of Government, conferring these extraordinary powers with us the Congress—the power to control their exercise if necessary, and the power to terminate them when the emergency shall have ended or when, in the judgment as with us of the two Houses of Congress, the power should no longer be exercised. By that procedure they have been able to defend themselves against dictatorial governments seeking their conquest and have escaped long periods of dictatorial government of their own.

This proposed amendment is not only in line with that sound public policy, but as stated, it is not open to objection on constitutional grounds, as some people assert. It does not propose to authorize

a repeal of the existing law by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. If adopted, the proposed amendment would become a provision in the structure of the law, a part of the law, agreed to by all the agencies of Government which participate in legislation. The provision would be in the law that upon the happening of an incident or contingency specified in the law, namely this concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the law itself should terminate by its own provision.

Not only should this character of control be retained with regard to this type of legislation conferring great discretionary powers with reference to the disposition of billions of dollars' worth of public property affecting directly or indirectly practically every individual and every business in the country, but the Congress and the country should be fully impressed with the extraordinary and dangerous character of this type of legislation, to be got rid of as soon as possible when the emergency shall have ended.

The Houses of Congress in connection with these grants of extraordinary emergency power should retain, as a matter of public policy, the power to control within the limits of their capacity and time, and the power to terminate, as their judgment and sense of duty may require. That retention is no indication of lack of confidence in the administrative agency. It is merely the nonsurrender of that which in the public interest they ought to retain.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of announcing to the House that inasmuch as the unanimous-consent request to return to section 10, for the purpose of offering the perfecting amendment which I have suggested, has been objected to, I intend, if consent be still refused, to offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to report it back with the amendment we adopted yesterday and to include in that amendment the two perfecting amendments that have been suggested here on the floor. One is to confine the scope of the Navy Department as a disposing agency to naval combat vessels and stations, and the other is to eliminate the word "facility." A motion to recommit with instructions to bring back the bill so amended will be made. I had hoped the amendments might be made here on the floor by consent, but if they cannot then they will be offered by way of a motion to recommit.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. With respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas I detain the Committee to say that it presents, as your Committee was advised, a very serious constitutional question. As the gentleman from Texas has stated, if you have the bill before you, on page 44, it would change this bill so that having given 3 years for the execution of the objectives and policies of the bill, Congress might provide by joint resolution of at least doubtful constitutionality, for

its earlier termination and thus involve the constitutionality of the act. It strikes me that as a general law, where the Administrator may be removed at any time, we ought not jeopardize the fundamental objectives and policies of this act by a provision of doubtful constitutionality. The remedy is, if we are not satisfied with the Administrator, for the Chief Executive, whoever he may be, to remove him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTINGTON) there were—ayes 74, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWYNNE: On page 44, after line 12, add a new section as follows:

"PENALTIES"

"Sec. 23. (a) Whoever with intent to defraud the Government of the United States, shall knowingly and willfully violate any of the provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons, with intent to defraud the Government of the United States, enter into any agreement, confederation, or conspiracy to violate any provision of this act, and do any overt act toward carrying out any such unlawful agreement, confederation, or conspiracy, such person or persons shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, although this act lays down a very definite course of conduct in the disposal of property, there are no penalties in the act. It is true it refers to or incorporates certain other laws in which penalties are provided. Those penalties would not cover all of the violations which might occur if this should become law. For example, you might have this situation, several people might conspire with an officer of the Government and the result might be that a million dollars' worth of property might be sold for a paltry sum. It is true that persons who have been guilty of fraud might be liable in a civil action. Furthermore the Government might bring an action to recover the property thus sold by fraud. But if it had passed into the hands of a bona fide purchaser that remedy would be unavailable to the Government. This amendment if adopted would not permit any penalty being imposed upon an innocent person. It would not penalize anyone for a mistake, no matter how stupid the mistake might be. It simply provides that any person who violates any provisions of this act and does it with the deliberate purpose of defrauding the Government may be punished in this manner.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I detain the Committee to say this in response to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, that the Committee went into the matter of penalties and, as we have stated during the gen-

eral debate, this is not a bill like the renegotiation or reconversion bill, where there are individuals and other agencies outside of the executive departments being utilized, but this is a bill which deals with the executive agencies of the Government, and we are advised that no penalties were necessary and that if there were any violations of the law in connection with the administration of the act, that existing criminal statutes were ample. We see no occasion for the amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it not the best philosophy always to write into every law everything that may plainly be accomplished under the law? This amendment can do no harm. It can only make clear that which the gentleman from Mississippi has suggested does exist, provided that search is made of the 100 other laws containing penalties now in force.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have high regard for the gentleman. I would not put my legal ability against his or against the legal ability of the gentleman from Iowa. If this one criminal penalty provision is placed in this bill with one penalty, it might restrict and prevent the operation of other penalties. On the other hand, we are advised that all statutes would be applicable to the applicable cases and I do not want to restrict the application of all criminal statutes now in force, to the one statute proposed by the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 23. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 24. This act may be cited as the "Surplus Property Act of 1944."

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the adoption of the committee substitute.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 620, reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

XC—455

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Under the rule, also, the substitute being considered as an original bill, any Member may ask for a separate vote on any amendment to the substitute.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Mott amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOTT: Page 31, line 22, after the word "proper", change the period to a colon and insert the following: "Provided, That no naval vessel, station, establishment or facility shall be sold, exchanged, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with the provisions of existing law specifically authorizing the same; and in all cases where such transactions have not been so specifically authorized, then no sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition of any naval vessel, station, establishment, or facility, shall be made unless the Congress by law shall authorize it: *Provided, further*, That the Navy Department shall be the sole disposal agency for all naval property."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit at this time a substitute for the Mott amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the substitute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to read it. The amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Oregon reads as follows:

Provided, That no naval vessel, station, establishment, or facility shall be sold, exchanged, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with the provisions of existing law specifically authorizing the same; and in all cases where such transactions have not been so specifically authorized, then no sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition of any naval vessel, station, establishment, or facility shall be made unless the Congress by law shall authorize it.

My proposal is to substitute an amendment which would read as follows:

That no combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be sold, leased, transferred—

And the same perfection in line 2, changing the words to "no combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be sold unless the Congress by law shall authorize it."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I ask the gentleman to read the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will read the amendment in full.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman read his full proposal?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will read it in full. I was simply explaining it, to show the changes that would be effected.

The amendment would read:

Provided, That no combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be sold, exchanged, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with the provisions of existing law specifically authorizing the same; and in all cases where such transactions have not been so specifically authorized, then no sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition of any combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be made unless the Congress by law shall authorize it.

Mr. MAAS. Is the second proviso dropped out?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also propose to strike the second proviso of the Mott amendment.

Mr. MOTT. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have not had a chance to write this yet.

Mr. MOTT. It was my understanding when I agreed to the language the gentleman has just read that there would also be a modification of the second proviso.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Washington is allowed to offer a substitute, it would take everything out of the Mott amendment that is not included in the substitute.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will just read on, it is all written there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The second proviso reads:

Provided further, That the Navy Department shall be the sole disposal agency for such naval property.

Mr. MOTT. For naval combat vessels or stations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Naval combat vessels, stations, or shore establishments.

Mr. MOTT. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman and I have agreed upon this language as a substitute for the original amendment, and as far as I am concerned, it is perfectly satisfactory to me, and I hope the House will adopt it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be reported by the Clerk in the usual course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was simply trying to explain the basis. I shall now, with the permission of the House, read the full amendment as agreed to by the gentleman from Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is now reading what he intends to offer as a substitute if he receives unanimous consent to do so; is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Provided, That no combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be sold, exchanged, leased, transferred, or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with the provisions of existing law specifically authorizing the same; and in all cases where such transactions have not been so specifically authorized, then no sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition of any combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be made unless the Congress by law shall authorize it: *Provided further*, That the Navy Department shall be the sole disposal agency for all such combat vessels, stations, or establishments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] when this matter was being perfected, to say that the second section shall be left out entirely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was my purpose in talking with the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] to limit the disposal by the Navy Department only to such combat vessels, establishments, and shore stations.

Mr. COLMER. Then as I understand the gentleman, the second provision of that amendment would have no effect except for the sale of those combat vessels?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Combat vessels, shore establishments, or stations. All this does is to limit the Mott amendment to combat vessels, shore establishments, and naval stations.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the matter has been very materially improved by the language suggested by the gentleman, but I have this question to ask: Having eliminated "facilities," I am wondering as to the meaning of the word "establishment." Would that include various air fields that have been established by the Navy Department in the interior, some of which have been offered for sale? I have in mind the field we voted on just before we took the recess in the latter part of June, the field located in Oklahoma. I am wondering if the term "establishments" would embrace such properties as that, and would also embrace plants, the small plants that have been established by the Defense Plants Corporation for the Navy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think naval interpretation of this language would include those items.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Would it include aircraft factories that have been established, if any such have been established by the Navy Department?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not believe it would include that, in naval interpretation.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, in order to keep the record straight, does the term "combat vessel" include tankers, supply ships and hospital ships, or does it include that type of vessel?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It excludes that type of vessel unless the department should determine in ratio to the combat vessels that they were a part of a task force. That takes care of itself, because the auxiliary strength in a navy is determined in ratio to its combat ship strength.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. But this amendment does not protect the disposition of tankers and auxiliaries?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it does not intend to. We are concerned with keeping up the combat strength.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. But you cannot keep it without tankers and auxiliaries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But those are determined in ratio to the combat vessels.

Mr. MAAS. They would have to be surplus over our combat vessels.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That may or may not be. The Navy would determine that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the bill passed by the House in June, we authorized the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of all vessels that he did not need in the naval service, under 1,000 tons. That is the present bill now resting in the Senate. That includes all tankers and what are called auxiliary ships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The G. I. bill of rights which the Congress recently passed authorized the Veterans' Administrator and the Secretary of the Navy to enter into an agreement for the transfer of hospital facilities. Would the term "establishment" include a naval hospital in this country?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It might, depending on what the navy wanted to call it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Then this would put a limitation on the G. I. bill of rights?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it would leave it in effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. MAGNUSON for the amendment on page 31, line 22, after the word "proper" change the period to a colon and insert the following: "Provided, That no combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be sold, exchanged, leased, transferred or otherwise disposed of except in accordance with existing law specifically authorizing the same and in all cases where such transactions have not been so specifically authorized then no sale, exchange, lease, transfer, or other disposition of any combat naval vessel, station, or establishment shall be made unless the Congress by law shall authorize it: *Provided further*, That the Navy Department shall be the sole disposal agency for all such combat vessels, stations, or establishments."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute to the bill.

The committee substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FOULSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FOULSON. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOULSON moves to recommit the bill H. R. 5125 to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments: Strike out all of section 3 from line 23 on page 25 to and including line 4 on page 27 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SURPLUS PROPERTY BOARD"

"Sec. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion a Surplus Property Board, which shall be composed of eight members, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum, and shall serve for a term of 2 years. In the selection of members of the Board the President shall give due consideration to the various geographic areas and economic interests of the Nation. The Board shall elect one of its members as chairman. In their deliberations the Board shall take into consideration the interests of all economic groups such as consumers, industry, agriculture, and labor. In case of a tie vote the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall have a deciding vote. During his term of membership on the Board, no member shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. The Board shall determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of this act.

"(b) In order that the elected representatives of the people shall be kept informed of the activities and the policies of the Board, the President of the Senate shall appoint two Members of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint two Members of the House of Representatives who shall be entitled to attend any meetings of the Board and who shall from time to time report to the Congress or to their respective Houses on the proceedings of the Board. It shall be the duty of the Chairman of the Board to advise such Members of all general or special meetings of the Board.

"(c) The Board shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint an Administrative Director, who shall perform such functions as the Board may direct and shall receive compensation at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The Board shall, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ and fix the compensation of such deputy administrative directors and other officers and employees, and may make such expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services, as may be necessary to carry out its functions. All such deputy administrative directors and other officers and employees shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and their compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Board shall, where practicable, perform the duties imposed upon it through the personnel and facilities of other Government agencies."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOESER) there were—ayes 38, noes 142.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill the Clerk be directed to make the necessary changes in sections, subsections, paragraph, subparagraph, and clause numbers and letters with reference thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR TEMPORARY MEMBERS OF COAST GUARD RESERVE DURING PERIOD OF DISABILITY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide pay and allowances for temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve during periods of disability resulting from injuries sustained or disease contracted in active service during the present war, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not for I believe this is a meritorious bill, but will the gentleman from Virginia explain it for the benefit of the membership?

Mr. BLAND. The bill has the unanimous support and endorsement of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and a favorable report from the Navy Department and the Coast Guard and from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission. The purpose of the bill is to take care of injuries and deaths of those men who are employed as temporary reservists and auxiliaries in the Coast Guard, men who are working for no compensation and who died and received no money. This would bring them within the operation of the Employees' Compensation Commission. It also provides paying for vessels that have been used as auxiliaries by the Coast Guard and have been lost.

The injury must be in line of action. These men have been called in by the Coast Guard in line of action and they have gone in there and served without pay.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These are patriotic volunteers and the gentleman wants to give them the same compensation a regular would receive?

Mr. BLAND. Absolutely.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve shall receive the pay and allowances of their respective ranks, grades, or ratings, during any

period in which they are unable to carry on their regular vocations by reason of injuries sustained or disease contracted in active service in the Coast Guard Reserve during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. Members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary who are not temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve shall be paid an allowance of \$6 per day during any period in which they are unable to carry on their regular vocations by reason of injuries sustained or disease contracted on active duty as members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President. Any such temporary member of the Coast Guard Reserve or member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary suffering such disability on or after December 7, 1941, but prior to the date of enactment of this act, shall be paid in a lump sum, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, the pay and/or allowances which he would have received under this act if this act had been in effect on and after December 7, 1941.

Sec. 2. The last sentence of section 212 of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. II, title 14, sec. 312), is amended to read as follows: "Any temporary member of the Reserve, or any member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary who is not a temporary member of the Reserve, who sustains injuries or contracts sickness or disease while performing active duty shall be furnished hospital care, including medical treatment, at any institution operated by any department or agency of the Government, or, if no such institution is available, shall be reimbursed for all expenses incurred for hospital care in private institutions, medical treatment, and nursing care. In addition, any such temporary member of the Reserve or member of the Auxiliary shall be reimbursed for all necessary expenses incurred as a result of his injury or illness."

Sec. 3. Section 1 of this act shall cease to be in effect 6 months after the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 212 (55 Stat. 12), as amended by the act of November 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 1021; 14 U. S. C., Supp. III, 312), of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 212. (a) In case of physical injury or death resulting from physical injury—

"(1) to any temporary member of the Reserve when incurred after February 19, 1941, in line of duty as a member of the Reserve, while on active duty or engaged in authorized travel to or from such duty; or

"(2) to any member of the Auxiliary not on active duty as a member of the military or naval forces, when incurred after February 19, 1941, while on Coast Guard patrol pursuant to the request of competent Coast Guard authority, and which would have been incurred in line of duty in the active service had he been a member of the Reserve acting under competent orders;

the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916 (5 U. S. C., ch. 15), as amended, subject to the other subsections of this section, shall apply, and such act shall be administered by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission (hereinafter called the Com-

mission) in the same manner and to the same extent as if such person were a civil employee of the United States and were injured while in the performance of his duty: *Provided*, That for benefit computation, regardless of pay or pay status, such person shall be deemed to have had monthly pay of \$150.

"(b) This section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or other jurisdiction because of a concurrent employment status of such member; and where such member or dependent should be entitled to a benefit under this section and also to any concurrent benefit from the United States on account of the same disability or death, such member or dependent shall elect which benefit he shall receive.

"(c) Whenever a claim is filed with the Commission for benefits because of an alleged injury or death within the purview of this section, the Commission shall notify the Commandant and he or his designee shall investigate the facts surrounding such alleged injury and make certification with respect thereto, including certification as to such injured or deceased person's membership in the Reserve or Auxiliary and his military status, and whether the injury or death occurred in line of duty or while on Coast Guard patrol pursuant to request of competent Coast Guard authority. Such certifications shall not excuse the making of such reports as are required by such act of September 7, 1916.

"(d) Notice of injury and any claim for benefits on account of disability or death within the purview of this section which occurred prior to the enactment of this amendment, may be received as timely filed, if filed within 1 year from the date of the approval of this amendatory act.

"(e) In case of physical injury incurred, or sickness or disease contracted (1) by any temporary member of the Reserve while performing active Coast Guard service, or (2) by any member of the Auxiliary not a regular or temporary member of the Reserve, while performing active Coast Guard patrol service pursuant to request of competent Coast Guard authority, such person shall be entitled to receive the same hospital treatment as is afforded members of the Regular Coast Guard."

"Sec. 2. Section 8, as amended by the act of June 6, 1942 (56 Stat. 329; 14 U. S. C., Supp. LI, 267), of the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 as amended is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Appropriations of the Coast Guard shall also be available for the payment for constructive or actual total loss occurring after March 1, 1942, of any motorboat or yacht utilized pursuant to section 6 of this act, where it is determined under regulations prescribed by the Commandant that responsibility for such loss rests with the Coast Guard.'

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEAVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include some remarks made at graduation exercises at Salinas, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Capt. Kenneth C. Bradley, national insurance officer for the Disabled American Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial and a newspaper article, and I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may have the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the next legislative day I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the Reverend John Schliepsick, of Hubbard, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include two separate editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks

in the RECORD and to include brief excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered in Chicago recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask what the program is expected to be this week and the next 2 weeks, if possible?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The next on the program is a bill now before the Ways and Means Committee and from the best information I have been able to secure it appears that this bill will not be ready for consideration before Monday. That is the only business on the program so far as I know at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. EATON (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 1 week, on account of official business.

VETERANS' ASSISTANCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in considering reconversion of buildings the Members of the Congress ought to insist that departments in Washington that are not necessary to be located here and where the personnel is not necessary to be located at Washington should leave Washington in order to give the Veterans' Administration the opportunity to carry on its work for the veterans pursuant to the G. I. bill. This organization should be housed under one roof. It is shameful for the disabled veterans to be shunted and pushed from department to department. It is very unfair, very unjust, and very cruel.

I spoke to General Hines yesterday about the appointment of an assistant director to be in charge of the disabled. Everyone wants to see General Hines when he is too busy to see them all, and there should be provided a special assistant administrator or director to help disabled veterans with their problems and to fight for their rights.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, August 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, August 23, 1944, to begin public hearings on S. 1473, a bill entitled "To amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended" and H. R. 5196, a bill entitled "To amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by authorizing common carriers to grant reduced fares to personnel of armed services."

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Morgan Line (Southern Pacific Co.) will continue its consideration of this matter on Thursday, August 24, 1944, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1777. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of the registrants deferred as of June 15, 1944, because of their employment in or under the Federal Government, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 5221. A bill to eliminate as uncollectible certain credits of the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 5222. A bill to provide uniform authority for the payment of travel expenses of consultants and other expert employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 5223. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5224 (by request). A bill to liberalize certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5225. A bill to permit the occupancy of vacant living accommodations in national defense housing projects by certain wives of members of the armed forces and by war veterans with wives or children; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON:

H. R. 5226. A bill to provide for the admission on motion of certain veterans to

practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5227 (by request). A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 5232. A bill to transfer jurisdiction over the Chattanooga National Cemetery, Chattanooga, Tenn., from the Department of the Interior to the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 5233. A bill amending paragraph 16, schedule A, of the Securities Act of 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5228 (by request). A bill for the relief of Daniel J. Weiner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 5229. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arens and David Arens, of New York City, doing business under the name of Dee Jay Hat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOTSON:

H. R. 5230. A bill for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 5231. A bill for the relief of Clarence W. Holmes; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

6027. Mr. WEAVER presented a petition of E. C. Waller and sundry other citizens of Buncombe County, N. C., in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23, 1944

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 15, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Joseph E. Gedra, assistant pastor, Immaculate Conception Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Most gracious Lord and Father in Heaven, we raise our minds and hearts to Thee in humble prayer to ask for a share in the splendor of Thy wisdom.

As we stand here in the Capitol of our Nation, it is our duty to take counsel for our people. They are Thine, and we are Thine, and we believe that it is by Thy providence we are chosen to deliberate for their welfare.

This is a time when the greatness of our human needs seems to transcend the powers of our human minds to understand and our capabilities to cope with them. Therefore, give us light, O Lord, that we may see Thy way of bringing to

our fellow citizens not only the enjoyment of all earthly gifts but also the recognition of Thy loving bounty as the source of these gifts: For "Not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." (Matthew iv : 4.)

But let us, before all, remember that both we and our brethren should find in union with Thee our greatest happiness and our highest purpose. Therefore, in Thy loving kindness grant that our service may help our countrymen and all the world to realize this best and highest purpose, that we may know strength and victory and peace and justice here on earth, and that both on earth and in heaven in Thy light we may see light. This we ask, O God, in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, August 22, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3704. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 5125. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|----------|-----------------|---------------|
| Alken | Green | O'Mahoney |
| Andrews | Guffey | Overton |
| Austin | Gurney | Pepper |
| Bankhead | Hatch | Radcliffe |
| Biewster | Hawkes | Robertson |
| Bridges | Hayden | Scruggs |
| Burton | Hill | Shipstead |
| Byrd | Jackson | Stewart |
| Capper | Johnson, Calif. | Taft |
| Caraway | Johnson, Colo. | Thomas, Okla. |
| Chandler | Kilgore | Thomas, Utah |
| Chavez | La Follette | Tobey |
| Connally | Langer | Tunnell |
| Cordon | McClellan | Tydings |
| Lanahan | McFarland | Vandenberg |
| Davis | McKelai | Wagner |
| Downey | Maloney | Walsh, N. J. |
| Eastland | Mead | Weeks |
| Ellender | Millikin | Wherry |
| Ferguson | Moore | White |
| George | O'Daniel | Wiley |

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BULO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY—HOUSE BILL ORDERED TO LIE ON THE TABLE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that House bill 5125, which has just come to the Senate, may be printed and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.

SIXTEENTH REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Pursuant to law, I am submitting herewith the sixteenth report to Congress on lend-lease operations.

Lend-lease supplies and services provided to our allies in the 3 months ending June 30, 1944, amounted to \$4,045,000,000 in value. In all, lend-lease aid has been provided in the amount of \$28,270,000,000.

Three years ago the Axis aggressors were well along the road to domination of the world. The United States itself was in grave danger. Today the United